

Université Paris 7 - Denis Diderot
U.F.R. de Mathématiques

Thèse de Doctorat

Spécialité: Logique et Fondements de l'Informatique

RONALD BUSTAMANTE MEDINA

**Théorie des modèles des corps
différentiellement clos avec un
automorphisme générique**

Soutenue le 10 novembre 2005

Directeur: Zoé Chatzidakis

Rapporteurs: Anand PILLAY
Thomas SCANLON

Jury: Elisabeth BOUSCAREN
Zoé CHATZIDAKIS
Françoise DELON
Angus MACINTYRE
Dugald MACPHERSON
Françoise POINT

Remerciements

Depuis le début de mes études en France Zoé Chatzidakis a été présente. Sans son soutien, diligence, patience et disposition cette thèse n'aurait jamais vu le jour. Son encouragement, son enthousiasme et ses idées m'ont toujours été très utiles et je lui en suis très reconnaissant.

Merci à Thomas Scanlon et Anand Pillay d'avoir accepté d'être les rapporteurs de ma thèse, ainsi qu'à Elisabeth Bouscaren, Françoise Delon, Angus Macintyre, Dugald Macpherson et Françoise Ponitde m'honorer de leur présence dans le jury.

Le D.E.A. a été une expérience enrichissante grâce aux enseignements de René Cori, Max Dickmann et Richard Lassaigne.

Je tiens à remercier Michèle Wasse, Virginie Kuntzmann et Khadija Bayoud pour leur accueil, aide et disponibilité.

Merci aux amis qui m'ont accueilli et aidé dès mon arrivée en France: Andrea, Gianluca, Eugenio, Miriam, Xosé, Oldemar. Je veux remercier également tous mes collègues du cinquième étage.

Merci à Gianmarco, Mouna, Emanuela et Zoé pour les repas, les thés, les cafés, la musique, le foot, le cinema et les journées gourmandes. Merci également à tous les amis du septième étage (grazie, gracias).

En Costa Rica quisiera agradecer a la gente de la Escuela de Matemáticas, en particular a Santiago Cambronero, Asdrúbal Duarte y Bernardo Montero. Gracias a la Oficina de Asuntos Internacionales de la Universidad de Costa Rica, en particular a Fátima Acosta y Yamileth Damazio por toda su ayuda. Agradezco al Consejo Nacional para Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas por su apoyo.

Muchísimas gracias a mi familia por su apoyo y ayuda a lo largo de estos años, muy especialmente a mi madre Mabel Medina Arana y a mi padre Ronald Bustamante Valle. Gracias a mis hermanos Mari, Gabi, Dani, Nati y Rodolfo. Muchas gracias a

Jen por todo.

Gracias a mi abuelo Don Paco, quien me inició en las matemáticas.

Gracias infinitas al infinito Sibú-Surá del mundo más arriba y el mundo más abajo.

Contents

Remerciements	ii
Notation	vi
Avant-propos	1
1 Preliminaries	9
1.1 Stable and Simple Theories	9
1.2 One-basedness, analyzability and local modularity	12
1.3 ω -stable theories with an automorphism	15
1.4 ω -Stable Groups	16
1.5 Definable Groups in Supersimple Theories	18
1.6 Differential Fields	19
1.7 Difference Fields	27
2 Difference-Differential Fields	31
2.1 Difference-Differential Algebra	31
2.2 The Model-Companion	33
2.3 The Field of Constants and the Fixed Field	40
2.4 Forking and the SU-Rank	42
2.5 Remarks on Stability, Stable Embeddability and 1-basedness	45
2.6 An Example	48
3 The Dichotomy Theorem	53
3.1 Algebraic Jet Spaces	53
3.2 Jet Spaces in Differential and Difference Fields	55
3.3 Jet Spaces in Difference-Differential Fields	56
3.4 Arc Spaces in Difference-Differential Fields	60
4 Definable Groups	73
4.1 A Definable Group is Embedded in an Algebraic Group	73
4.2 Abelian Groups	75

Notation

$K[\bar{X}]_{\sigma,D}$, ring of difference-differential polynomials over K .
 $(A)_{\sigma,D}$, smallest difference-differential field containing A .
 A^{alg} , field-theoretic algebraic closure of A .
 $acl(A)$, model-theoretic algebraic closure of A .
 $acl(A)_D$, algebraic closure of the smallest differential field containing A .
 $acl(A)_{\sigma}$, algebraic closure of the smallest difference field containing A .
 $acl(A)_{\sigma,D}$, algebraic closure of the smallest difference-differential field containing A .
 $E(a)_D$, the field generated by E and $\{D^j a; j \in \mathbb{N}\}$.
 $E(a)_{\sigma}$, the field generated by E and $\{\sigma^i(a); i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.
 $E(a)_{\sigma,D}$, the field generated by E and $\{\sigma^i(D^j a); i \in \mathbb{Z}, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$.
 V^{σ} , image of V by σ .
 $V(K)$, elements of V with all its coordinates in K .
 $\mathcal{L} = \{+, -, \cdot, 0, 1\}$.
 $\mathcal{L}_D = \mathcal{L} \cup \{D\}$.
 $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma} = \mathcal{L} \cup \{\sigma\}$.
 $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,D} = \mathcal{L} \cup \{\sigma, D\}$.
 ACF , the theory of algebraically closed fields.
 $qfDiag(E)$, quantifier-free diagram of E : the set of quantifier-free closed $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,D}(E)$ -formulas satisfied by some $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,D}$ -structure containing E .
 $S_n(A)$, set of complete n -types with parameters in A .
 $\tau_m(V)$, m -th (differential) prolongation of the variety V .
 $J^m(V)_a$, m -th jet space of the variety V at a .
 $\Phi_m(V)$, m -th (σ, D) -prolongation of the variety V .
 $\mathcal{A}_m V_a$, m -th arc space of the variety V at a .
 $T_{\sigma,D}(V)_a$, m -th (σ, D) -tangent space of the variety V at a .
 $A^{\sharp}$, Manin kernel of the Abelian variety A .

Avant-propos

L'étude modèle-théorique des corps enrichis, c'est à dire, munis d'un ou de plusieurs opérateurs (dérivation, automorphisme, λ -fonctions ou dérivations de Hasse pour les corps séparablement clos), ou bien d'une valuation, a connu ces dernières années un essor spectaculaire, dû en grande partie aux applications de la théorie des modèles de ces corps, associée à la *Stabilité Géométrique*, pour résoudre des questions en Géométrie Diophantienne. Mentionnons par exemple les travaux de Hrushovski sur la Conjecture de Mordell-Lang pour les corps de fonctions (utilisant les corps différentiellement clos, et les corps séparablement clos), ceux encore de Hrushovski sur la conjecture de Manin-Mumford et qui donnent des bornes effectives (utilisant les corps de différence), et enfin ceux de Scanlon sur la distance p -adique des points de torsion (corps valués de différence) et sur la conjecture de Denis sur les modules de Drinfeld (corps de différence). Un des ingrédients communs à la démonstration de ces résultats, est le fait que certains ensembles définissables contenant ceux dans lesquels nous sommes intéressés (par exemple, le sous-groupe de torsion) sont mono-basés. En effet, un résultat déjà relativement ancien, nous dit que ces ensembles se comportent bien :

Théorème (Hrushovski-Pillay [11]). Soit G un groupe stable mono-basé, défini sur $\emptyset$. Alors tout sous-ensemble définissable de G^n est une combinaison Booléenne de cosets de sous-groupes définissables de G^n . De plus, ces sous-groupes sont définis sur $acl(\emptyset)$.

Ce résultat dit deux choses : tout d'abord, G ne contiendra pas de famille infinie de sous-groupes définissables. Ensuite, la description des ensembles définissables permettra souvent de déduire que l'ensemble auquel nous nous intéressons, est une *union finie* de cosets de sous-groupes de G .

Jusqu'au milieu des années 90, l'utilisation des outils de la Stabilité Géométrique était réservée aux structures dont la théorie est stable : les corps algébriquement clos, séparablement clos, ou bien différentiellement clos. Les travaux de Hrushovski sur la conjecture de Manin-Mumford ont montré que ces techniques pouvaient aussi s'appliquer dans des cas instables : celui des corps avec automorphisme générique. On s'est alors aperçu que la théorie de ces corps était supersimple. La simplicité est une propriété de certaines théories qui a été remarquée par Shelah en 1980, mais

peu étudiée jusqu'en 1995, quand Kim a montré que les théories simples avaient des propriétés très intéressantes, notamment la symétrie de la déviation (la déviation est une généralisation modèle-théorique de la notion de dépendance, algébrique ou linéaire par exemple). Le développement de l'étude des théories simples a montré que en effet, on pouvait souvent appliquer à leurs modèles des techniques provenant de la stabilité.

Dans cette thèse, nous nous intéressons au cas des corps *de caractéristique 0* munis d'une dérivation D et d'un automorphisme σ qui commute avec D (appelés corps différentiels de différence), et plus particulièrement aux modèles existentiellement clos de cette classe (appelés corps différentiellement clos avec un automorphisme générique). Ce sont des corps différentiels de différence tels que tout système fini d'équations différentielles de différence à coefficients dans le corps et qui a une solution dans une extension, a déjà une solution dans le corps. Hrushovski a montré que les corps différentiels avec automorphisme générique forment une classe élémentaire. On sait par ailleurs que la théorie d'un tel corps est supersimple, ce qui a plusieurs conséquences importantes pour notre étude.

Le but de cette thèse est d'étudier la théorie de ces corps (notée $DCFA$), et de voir dans quelle mesure les résultats qui ont été prouvés pour les corps différentiellement clos et pour les corps avec automorphisme générique (dont les théories seront notées respectivement DCF et $ACFA$) peuvent être généralisés à ces corps. De plus, l'existence de deux opérateurs donne une structure plus riche, et l'étude ces corps permettra peut-être d'isoler des phénomènes nouveaux.

Les travaux de cette thèse commencent par un chapitre de préliminaires, qui pour l'essentiel rappelle des notions connues, mais montre aussi quelques résultats nouveaux. Nous continuons dans le chapitre 2 avec la description de la théorie $DCFA$, et avec quelques résultats assez généraux. Le chapitre 3 donne une démonstration de la dichotomie corps/monobasé pour les ensembles de rang 1. Enfin le chapitre 4 étudie les groupes définissables, et plus particulièrement les sous-groupes définissables de groupes algébriques commutatifs. Ci-dessous nous exposons les résultats plus en détail.

Chapitre 1

Ce chapitre est divisé en plusieurs sections. Dans la première, nous rappelons certaines des définitions et propriétés des théories stables et des théories simples que nous utiliserons par la suite, en particulier le résultat de Kim-Pillay qui caractérise la notion d'indépendance (ou de non-déviabilité) dans les théories simples. Nous introduisons aussi le rang SU , une généralisation du rang U de Lascar (un rang est une notion de dimension, mais qui peut prendre des valeurs ordinales), ainsi que certaines de ses propriétés. La section suivante rappelle les notions fondamentales de

stabilité géométrique : orthogonalité, régularité, internalité et analysabilité, monobaséité et modularité locale, poids, domination, etc. Nous y prouvons deux petits lemmes, qui nous seront utiles pour nous réduire au cas de types réguliers de rang ω^i , pour lesquels nous n'avons pas trouvé de référence explicite. Le premier est bien connu des spécialistes, et en plus grande généralité. Le deuxième est connu quand $\alpha = 0$, mais à notre connaissance (et après avoir consulté F. Wagner) est nouveau. Nous travaillons dans une théorie supersimple qui élimine les imaginaires.

Lemme 1.2.24. *Soit $q = tp(a, b)$ un type régulier, et $p = tp(a)$. Alors q est localement modulaire si et seulement si q est localement modulaire.*

Lemma 1.2.25. *Soit $p = tp(a/A)$ un type régulier de rang $SU \beta + \omega^\alpha$ et de poids 1. Alors il existe $b \in acl(Aa)$ tel que $SU(a/A) = \omega^\alpha$.*

Dans la section 3, nous rappelons les résultats déjà connus sur la théorie des modèles avec automorphisme générique : soit T une théorie dans un langage $\mathcal{L}$, qui est stable et élimine les quantificateurs et les imaginaires. Nous rajoutons au langage un symbole de fonction σ et considérons la théorie T_0 des modèles M de T dans lesquels σ est interprété par un automorphisme. On sait, par des résultats de Chatzidakis-Pillay ([3]) que si la modèle-compagne (notée T_A) de cette théorie existe, alors : on peut décrire facilement les complétions de T_A et leurs types ; toutes les complétions de T_A sont simples, et supersimples si la théorie T est superstable ; on a une bonne description de la clôture algébrique et de la relation d'indépendance.

Dans les sections 4 et 5 nous nous intéressons aux groupes ω -stables et aux groupes définissables dans les théories simples. Nous rappelons quelques notions de base, comme les stabilisateurs et les types génériques, ainsi que leurs propriétés.

Le reste du chapitre est plus algébrique. Nous rappelons dans la section 6 les résultats bien connus sur les corps différentiels et les corps différentiellement clos, la topologie de Kolchin, les variétés et idéaux différentiels, etc. . Pour pouvoir donner une axiomatisation de la théorie $DCFA$, nous rappelons les notions de prolongations de variétés algébriques, et introduisons les notions de variétés en forme normale et de points (m, D) -génériques. Nous montrons que les points (m, D) -génériques d'une variété en forme normale ont tous le même type dans DCF , et que la question de savoir si les points (m, D) -génériques d'une variété en forme normale se projettent sur les points (m, D) -génériques d'une autre variété en forme normale, se réduit à une question de dominance de morphisme de variétés algébriques. Ces notions nous permettent donc d'éviter de répondre aux deux questions suivantes :

- Quand des polynômes différentiels engendrent-ils un idéal différentiel premier?
- Si $I \subset K[X, Y]_D$ et $J \subset K[X]_D$ sont des idéaux différentiels premiers donnés par des systèmes de générateurs, quand avons nous $I \cap K[X, Y]_D = J$?

Ces questions sont certainement résolues dans la littérature, mais nous n'avons pas trouvé de bonne référence, et de plus notre approche est plus dans l'esprit des axiomatisations géométriques.

Dans la section 7, nous rappelons les définitions de base sur les corps de différence, la σ -topologie, et la théorie $ACFA$ des corps algébriquement clos avec automorphisme générique.

Chapitre 2

Le deuxième chapitre commence par une introduction générale aux corps différentiels de différence. Un résultat très important est la Noethérianité de la (σ, D) -topologie. Ensuite nous utilisons les résultat du chapitre 1 pour donner un schéma d'axiomes pour la théorie $DCFA$. (Les résultats de Hrushovski montrant que les corps différentiellement clos avec automorphisme générique forment une classe élémentaire ne sont pas publiés).

Comme on l'a vu dans le chapitre 1, l'existence d'une modèle-compagne de la théorie des corps différentiels avec un automorphisme a quelques conséquences immédiates:

1. Les complétions de $DCFA$ sont obtenues en décrivant le type d'isomorphisme du corps de différence $(\mathbb{Q}^{alg}, \sigma)$.
2. Soit $K \models DCFA$, et $A \subset K$. La clôture algébrique de A est le plus petit sous-corps différentiel algébriquement clos de K qui contient A et est clos par σ et σ^{-1} .
3. L'indépendance est décrite de la façon suivante : A et B sont indépendants au dessus de C (noté : $A \perp_C B$) si et seulement si les corps $acl(CA)$ et $acl(CB)$ sont linéairement disjoints au-dessus de $acl(C)$.
4. Toute complétion de $DCFA$ est supersimple et satisfait au Théorème d'indépendance au dessus d'un corps de différence différentiellement clos.

Comme dans $ACFA$, nous montrons ensuite que le Théorème d'indépendance est vrai au dessus d'un ensemble algébriquement clos :

Théorème 2.2.17 *Si $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$ est un modèle saturé de $DCFA$, E un sous-ensemble algébriquement clos de $\mathcal{U}$, et $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2$ sont des uplets de $\mathcal{U}$ tels que :*

1. $tp(\bar{c}_1/E) = tp(\bar{c}_2/E)$.
2. $\bar{a} \perp_E \bar{c}_1$, $\bar{a} \perp_E \bar{b}$ et $\bar{b} \perp_E \bar{c}_2$.

Alors il existe $\bar{c}$ réalisant $tp(\bar{c}_1/E \cup \bar{a}) \cup tp(\bar{c}_2/E \cup \bar{b})$ tel que $\bar{c} \perp_E (\bar{a}, \bar{b})$.

Ce théorème nous permet de montrer que toute complétion de $DCFA$ élimine les imaginaires, voir 2.2.22. Il nous permet aussi de montrer que le corps différentiel $Fix(\sigma) = \{x \in \mathcal{U} : \sigma(x) = x\}$ est stablement plongé, c'est-à-dire que si $S \subset (Fix\sigma)^n$ est $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,D}$ -définissable (avec paramètres dans $\mathcal{U}$), alors il est définissable avec paramètres dans $Fix\sigma$. De plus, S est définissable dans le langage des corps différentiels.

Dans la section 2.3 on étudie le corps de constantes $\mathcal{C} = \{x : Dx = 0\}$ et le corps fixe $Fix(\sigma)$ d'un modèle de $DCFA$: étant donné un modèle (K, σ, D) de $DCFA$, on montre que $(\mathcal{C}, \sigma)$ est un modèle de $ACFA$ (2.3.1), mais qu'il n'est pas stablement plongé : il existe des sous-ensembles définissables de $\mathcal{C}$ qui ne sont pas définis sur $\mathcal{C}$. Pour $Fix\sigma$ on montre aussi la chose suivante:

Théorème 2.3.4 $((Fix\sigma)^{alg}, D)$ est un modèle de DCF .

Ce résultat nous permet de décrire les structures de la forme (F, D) où F est le corps fixé d'un modèle de $DCFA$. Ces résultats ont été obtenus indépendamment (et dans un cadre plus général) par Pillay et Polkowska, voir [29].

La section suivante est dédiée à l'étude du rang SU pour les complétions de $DCFA$; entre autres résultats on montre que le rang SU d'un générique d'un modèle de $DCFA$ est ω^2 . Nous donnons aussi des bornes sur le rang SU d'un élément, et donnons quelques exemples.

Dans 2.5, nous isolons des conditions pour qu'un type dans $DCFA$ soit stable stablement plongé.

Les sous-ensembles définissables qui sont stables stablement plongés sont des ensembles qui sont stables pour la structure induite. On peut donc leur appliquer tous les résultats valides dans les théories stables. Les conditions obtenues nous serviront pour l'étude des groupes abéliens dans le chapitre 4. Par exemple, nous montrons que dans plusieurs cas, un type sera stable stablement plongé si son réduit au langage des corps de différence est stable stablement plongé pour la théorie $ACFA$, voir 2.5.6 et 2.5.7.

Dans la dernière section de ce chapitre nous donnons un exemple d'un ensemble de rang SU 1 mais de dimension infinie. Soit (K, σ, D) un modèle de $DCFA$, soit $A = \{x \in K : \sigma(x) = x^2 + 1 \wedge Dx \neq 0\}$. Si E est un sous-corps différentiel de différence de K , et $a \in A$ n'est pas algébrique sur E , alors a est différentiellement transcendant sur E . Cela entraîne que l'ensemble A est fortement minimal et nous montrons aussi qu'il est stablement plongé.

Chapitre 3

Le chapitre 3 est consacré à la démonstration de la dichotomie de Zilber dans un modèle de $DCFA$. On veut montrer que si $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$ est un modèle de $DCFA$, K un sous-corps différentiel de différence algébriquement clos de $\mathcal{U}$ et $a \in \mathcal{U}$ tel que $SU(a/K) = 1$, alors ou

bien $tp(a/K)$ est monobasé, ou bien $tp(a/K)$ est non-orthogonal à $\mathcal{C} \cap Fix\sigma$. La preuve de ce résultat est faite en deux parties, en considérant d'abord le cas de *dimension finie*, c'est à dire quand $tr.dg(acl(Ka)/K) < \infty$, puis le cas général. Dans le cas de dimension finie, nous utilisons les techniques des espaces de jets introduites par Pillay et Ziegler dans ([30]) et montrons :

Théorème 3.3.8 *Soit $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$ un modèle saturé de DCFA et soit $tp(a/K)$ un type de dimension finie. Soit b tel que $b = Cb(qftp(a/K, b))$. Alors $tp(b/acl(K, a))$ est presque interne à $Fix\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$.*

A partir de ce résultat nous pouvons déduire une dichotomie partielle :

Corollaire 3.3.9 *Si $p = tp(a/K)$ a SU -rang 1 et est de dimension finie, alors ou bien p est monobasé, ou bien il est non-orthogonal à $Fix\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$.*

Dans la deuxième partie de la preuve nous utilisons les techniques des espaces d'arcs introduites par Moosa, Pillay et Scanlon ([22]) pour montrer :

Théorème 3.4.31 *Soit p un type régulier et non localement modulaire. Alors il existe un sous-groupe définissable du groupe additif dont le type générique est régulier et non-orthogonal à p .*

Pour montrer ce résultat on définit d'abord la suite de prolongations d'une (σ, D) -variété V : grosso modo, pour chaque l , on prend la clôture de Zariski V_l de l'ensemble

$$\{(a, \sigma(a), \dots, \sigma^l(a), Da, \sigma(Da), \dots, \sigma^l(D^l(a))) : a \in V\},$$

avec les projections naturelles $V_{l+1} \rightarrow V_l$. La difficulté essentielle réside dans l'identification des conditions nécessaires et suffisantes pour qu'une telle suite de variétés algébriques soit la suite de prolongations associée à une (σ, D) -variété. Ensuite nous définissons les espaces d'arcs de la façon suivante : si $m \in \mathbb{N}$, nous considérons la suite d'espace d'arcs $\mathcal{A}_m V_l$ avec les projections naturelles. Nous rencontrons cependant une difficulté, car il faut enlever les points singuliers des variétés V_l , ainsi que d'autres points. Cela nous amène à définir la notion de points non-singuliers d'une (σ, D) -variété, et à définir l'espace d'arcs $\mathcal{A}_m V_a$ seulement au-dessus des points non-singuliers, comme étant la (σ, D) -variété associée à une suite de prolongations locales au-dessus de a . Notons que les points singuliers forment un ensemble qui est à priori une union dénombrable de fermés de la variété V , et nous ne pouvons donc pas les enlever de façon différentiellement birationnelle. De même, nous définissons l'espace tangent $T(V)_a$ au-dessus d'un point non-singulier a en utilisant comme suite de prolongations la suite des espaces tangents au-dessus de a , $(a, \sigma(a), Da, \sigma(Da))$, etc. Comme dans le cas des variétés algébriques, on montre alors que les fibres des projections $\mathcal{A}_{m+1} V_a \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_m V_a$ sont des espaces homogènes pour $T(V)_a$. Ce résultat est un des ingrédients fondamentaux de la preuve.

Dans le cas d'un type de SU -rang 1, la modularité locale et la monobaséité coïncident. Nous montrons aussi que le générique d'un sous-groupe définissable du groupe additif est

de dimension finie si et seulement si il est de rang SU fini. En combinant tous ces résultats, nous obtenons alors la dichotomie :

Théorème 3.4.33 *Soit p un type de SU -rang 1. Si p n'est pas mono-basé, alors il est non-orthogonal à $Fix\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$.*

Chapitre 4

Dans le quatrième chapitre nous étudions quelques classes de groupes définissables dans un modèle de $DCFA$. Dans 4.1 nous utilisons les techniques de Kowalski-Pillay pour montrer qu'un groupe définissable est isogène à un sous-groupe définissable d'un groupe algébrique. Cela ramène l'étude des groupes définissables à celle des sous-groupes définissables d'un groupe algébrique.

Théorème 4.1.5 *Soient $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$ un modèle de $DCFA$, $K \prec \mathcal{U}$ et G un groupe K -définissable. Alors il existe un groupe algébrique H , un sous-groupe définissable d'indice fini G_1 de G , et un isomorphisme définissable entre G_1/N_1 et H_1/N_2 , où H_1 est un sous-groupe définissable de $H(\mathcal{U})$, N_1 est un sous-groupe normal fini de G_1 , et N_2 est un sous-groupe normal fini de H_1 .*

La deuxième section est dédiée à l'étude des groupes commutatifs. Nous nous intéressons surtout à la propriété d'être mono-basé, et c'est pourquoi nous restreignons notre attention aux groupes commutatifs. Grâce à un théorème de Wagner, cette étude se réduit à l'étude des sous-groupes du groupe additif, sous-groupes du groupe multiplicatif, et sous-groupes d'une variété Abélienne simple. Pour les groupes additifs on montre le résultat suivant:

Proposition 4.2.1 *Aucun sous-groupe définissable infini du groupe additif $\mathbb{G}_a$ n'est monobasé.*

Cela provient du fait que tout sous-groupe définissable de $\mathbb{G}_a$ est un $Fix\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$ -espace vectoriel. Dans le cas du groupe multiplicatif on utilise la dérivée logarithmique et un résultat de Hrushovski sur les sous-groupes définissables de $\mathbb{G}_m$ dans $ACFA$. Nous obtenons:

Soit H un sous-groupe définissable de $\mathbb{G}_m$. Si $H \not\subset \mathbb{G}_m(\mathcal{C})$, alors H n'est pas monobasé. Si $H < \mathbb{G}(\mathcal{C})$, alors H est monobasé si et seulement si il est monobasé dans le corps de différence $\mathcal{C}$, et dans ce cas il sera aussi stable stablement plongé.

Les résultats de Hrushovski [10] nous donnent alors une description complète des sous-groupes monobasés de $\mathbb{G}_m(\mathcal{C})$. Dans le cas des variétés Abéliennes simples on regarde le noyau de Manin, qui existe pour n'importe quelle variété Abélienne.

Proposition 4.2.6 *Soit A une variété Abélienne. Alors il existe un homomorphisme D -définissable $\mu : A \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_a^n$, où $n = \dim(A)$, tel que $Ker(\mu)$ a rang de Morley fini.*

$Ker(\mu)$ est la D -clôture de $Tor(A)$, on appelle $Ker(\mu)$ le noyau de Manin de A et on le note $A^\sharp$. Quand A est simple $A^\sharp$ est un sous-groupe minimal.

Définition *On dit qu'une variété Abélienne descend aux constantes si elle est isomorphe à une variété Abélienne définie sur le corps des constantes.*

Soit A une variété Abélienne simple. Nous distinguerons deux cas : quand la variété A descend aux constantes et quand elle ne le fait pas. Si A est définie sur $\mathcal{C}$, alors $A^\sharp = A(\mathcal{C})$, et sinon, alors $A^\sharp$ est monobasé (pour la théorie DCF), et donc sera fortement minimal. Dans les deux cas on utilisera la dichotomie et les résultats de la section 5 du chapitre 2. Le théorème suivant nous donne une description de la mono-baséité des sous-groupes d'une variété Abélienne:

Théorème 4.2.12 *Soit A une variété Abélienne simple, et soit H un sous-groupe de $A(\mathcal{U})$ définissable sans quantificateurs sur $K = acl(K)$. Si $H \not\subset A^\sharp(\mathcal{U})$, alors H est non mono-basé. Supposons maintenant que $H \subset A^\sharp(\mathcal{U})$, et soit a un générique de H sur K . Alors*

1. *Si A descend aux constantes, alors H est mono-basé si et seulement si H est stable stablement plongé, si et seulement si $tp_{ACFA}(a/K)$ est héréditairement orthogonal à $(\sigma(x) = x)$.*
2. *Si A ne descend pas aux constantes, alors H est mono-basé. De plus*
 - (a) *Si quelque soit k , A n'est pas isomorphe à une variété Abélienne définie sur $Fix\sigma^k$, alors H est stable stablement plongé.*
 - (b) *Supposons que A est définie sur $Fix(\sigma)$. Alors H est stable stablement plongé si et seulement si $tp_{ACFA}(a/K)$ est stable stablement plongé.*

Les résultats de [10] nous donnent alors une description complète des sous-groupes H qui ne sont pas mono-basés dans les cas (1) et (2)(b) ci-dessus.

Chapter 1

Preliminaries

1.1 Stable and Simple Theories

We mention the results and definitions on stable and simple theories that we will need in the following chapters. We assume that the reader is familiar with the basic notions of stability and simplicity. For more details see [24] and [25] for stable theories, and [12] and [35] for simple theories.

We will focus on ω -stable theories. A theory is said to be ω -stable if, given any model M , and countable set $A \subset M$, there are countable many complete types over A .

We will always work in a countable language, and in that case being ω -stable is equivalent to being totally transcendental, that is, any definable set of a model of the theory has Morley rank.

We will consider T a complete ω -stable theory over a countable language $\mathcal{L}$, and M a saturated model of T . We denote by $S_n(A)$ the space of n -types over the set A . One of the main properties of ω -stable theories is that every type is definable: If $A = acl^{eq}(A) \subset M^{eq}$ and $p \in S_n(A)$, then for each formula $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$, where x is an n -tuple, there is an $\mathcal{L}(A)$ -formula $d_p\varphi(\bar{y})$ such that for all tuple $\bar{a}$ of A , $\varphi(x, \bar{a}) \in p$ if and only if $d_p\varphi(\bar{a})$ is satisfied in M .

The notion of canonical base in stable theories will be useful for our case.

Definition 1.1.1 *Let $\mathbf{p}$ be a global type (a type over M). The canonical base of $\mathbf{p}$, $Cb(\mathbf{p})$ is a tuple of M^{eq} which is fixed pointwise precisely by those automorphisms of M which fix $\mathbf{p}$.*

Proposition 1.1.2 *Any global type has a canonical base which is unique up to interdefinability.*

Let $A \subset M$. Let $p \in S(A)$. We say that p is stationary if for every $B \supset A$, p has a unique non-forking extension to B . For a stationary type $p \in S(A)$ we define the canonical base of p , $Cb(p)$ as the canonical base of the unique non-forking extension of p to M .

Definition 1.1.3 Let $A \subset M$ and $a \in M$. The strong type of a over A , $\text{stp}(a/A)$ is the type of a over $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A)$.

Remark 1.1.4

1. Let $A \subset M$, and let $p \in S(A)$ be stationary. Then $\text{Cb}(p)$ is the smallest definably closed subset c of $\text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(A)$ such that p does not fork over c and the restriction of p to c is stationary.
2. Let a be a finite tuple of M , and let $A \subset B \subset M$. Then $\text{tp}(a/B)$ does not fork over A if $\text{Cb}(\text{stp}(a/B)) \subset \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A)$.
3. Let $A \subset M$, and let $p \in S(A)$ be stationary. Then there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $a_1, \dots, a_N$ are independent realizations of p then $\text{Cb}(p) \subset \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(a_1, \dots, a_N)$.

Now we will concentrate on simple theories, more specifically on supersimple theories. To define simplicity we need the notions of dividing and forking of types, however in [12], Kim and Pillay proved an equivalence which allows us to define simplicity with the notion of independence between tuples.

Theorem 1.1.5 Let T be a complete theory. T is supersimple if and only if, given a large, saturated model M of T , there is an independence relation $\perp$ between tuples of M over subsets of M which satisfies the following properties:

1. Invariance: Let a be a tuple of M , and $B, C \subset M$ such that $a \perp_C B$; let τ be an automorphism of M . Then $\tau(a) \perp_{\tau(C)} \tau(B)$.
2. Local: For all finite tuple a , and for all B there is a finite subset C of $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(B)$ such that $a \perp_C B$.
3. Extension: For all tuple a , for all set B and for all C containing B there is a tuple a' such that $\text{tp}(a/B) = \text{tp}(a'/B)$ and $a' \perp_B C$.
4. Symmetry: For all tuples a, b and for all C , $a \perp_C b$ if and only if $b \perp_C a$.
5. Transitivity: Let a be a tuple and let $A \subset B \subset C$. Then $a \perp_B C$ and $a \perp_A B$ if and only if $a \perp_A C$.
6. Independence Theorem: If $N \prec M$ is such that $|N| < |M|$, and $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2$ are tuples of M such that:

$$(a) \text{tp}(\bar{c}_1/N) = \text{tp}(\bar{c}_2/N).$$

$$(b) \bar{a} \perp_N \bar{c}_1, \bar{a} \perp_N \bar{b} \text{ and } \bar{b} \perp_N \bar{c}_2.$$

Then there is $\bar{c} \in M$ realizing $\text{tp}(\bar{c}_1/N \cup \bar{a}) \cup \text{tp}(\bar{c}_2/N \cup \bar{b})$ such that $\bar{c} \perp_N (\bar{a}, \bar{b})$.

Furthermore, the relation $\perp$ then coincides with non-forking.

Thus, in particular, we can define a rank in analogy to the Lascar rank for superstable theories.

Definition 1.1.6 *Let T be a supersimple theory and let M be a model of T . Let $A \subset M$ and $\bar{a}$ be a tuple of M . We define the SU -rank of $tp(\bar{a}/A)$, $SU(\bar{a}/A)$, by induction as follows:*

1. $SU(\bar{a}/A) \geq 0$.
2. For an ordinal α , $SU(\bar{a}/A) \geq \alpha + 1$ if and only if there is a forking extension q of $tp(\bar{a}/A)$ such that $SU(q) \geq \alpha$.
3. If α is a limit ordinal, then $SU(\bar{a}/A) \geq \alpha$ if and only if $SU(\bar{a}/A) \geq \beta$ for all $\beta \in \alpha$.

We define $SU(\bar{a}/A)$ to be the smallest ordinal α such that $SU(\bar{a}/A) \geq \alpha$ but $SU(\bar{a}/A) \not\geq \alpha + 1$.

Lascar's inequalities hold for the SU -rank. We need the natural sum of ordinals.

Definition 1.1.7 *If α, β are ordinal numbers, we can write in a unique way $\alpha = \omega^{\alpha_1}a_1 + \dots + \omega^{\alpha_k}a_k$ and $\beta = \omega^{\beta_1}b_1 + \dots + \omega^{\beta_l}b_l$ where $\alpha_1 > \dots > \alpha_k$, $\beta_1 > \dots > \beta_l$ are ordinals, and $a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_l$ are positive integers. If we allow them to be zero we can suppose $k = l$, and $\alpha_i = \beta_i$ for all i . We define the natural sum of ordinals by $\alpha \oplus \beta = \omega^{\alpha_1}(a_1 + b_1) + \dots + \omega^{\alpha_k}(a_k + b_k)$.*

Fact 1.1.8 *Let T be a supersimple theory and M a model of T . Let a, b be tuples of M , A, B subsets of M . Let α be an ordinal. Then:*

1. $SU(a/Ab) + SU(b/A) \leq SU(ab/A) \leq SU(a/Ab) \oplus SU(b/A)$.
2. If $SU(a/A) \geq SU(a/Ab) \oplus \alpha$, then $SU(b/A) \geq SU(b/Aa) + \alpha$.
3. If $SU(a/A) \geq SU(a/Ab) + \omega^\alpha$, then $SU(b/A) \geq SU(b/Aa) + \omega^\alpha$.
4. If $a \perp_A b$, then $SU(ab/A) = SU(a/A) \oplus SU(b/A)$.

For simple theories there is a notion of canonical base, which is defined with the help of amalgamation bases. However, for the case of difference-differential fields we can avoid this definition, and use the notion of quantifier-free canonical base which we will define later.

1.2 One-basedness, analyzability and local modularity

We introduce some helpful concepts and results concerning supersimple theories. They are analogous definitions for stable theories. For more details see [35].

Let M be a saturated model of a supersimple theory T which eliminates imaginaries.

Definition 1.2.1 *Let $A, B \subset M$, $p \in S(A)$, $q \in S(B)$.*

1. *Let us suppose that $A = B$. We say that p is almost orthogonal to q , denoted by $p \perp^a q$, if any two realizations of p and q are independent over A .*
2. *We say that p is orthogonal to q , denoted by $p \perp q$, if for every set $C \supset A \cup B$ and for every two extensions $p', q' \in S(C)$ of p, q respectively, such that p' does not fork over A and q' does not fork over B , we have that $p' \perp^a q'$.*
3. *Let $\varphi(x) \in \mathcal{L}(B)$. We say that p is orthogonal to φ , denoted by $p \perp \varphi$, if for every type q over B containing φ , we have $p \perp q$.*
4. *If $SU(p) = 1$, we say that p is trivial if for every $C \supset A$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n$ realizing non-forking extensions of p to C , the tuples $a_1, \dots, a_n$ are independent over C if and only if they are pairwise independent.*

Proposition 1.2.2 *Let $a \in M$ and $A \subset M$. Let us suppose that $SU(a/A) = \beta + \omega^\alpha \cdot n$, with $n > 0$ and $\omega^{\alpha+1} \leq \beta < \infty$ or $\beta = 0$. Then $tp(a/A)$ is non-orthogonal to a type of SU -rank ω^α . Moreover there is $b \in \text{acl}(Aa)$ with $SU(b/A) = \omega^\alpha n$.*

Definition 1.2.3

1. *Let $A \subset M$ and let S be an (∞) -definable set over A . We say that S is 1-based if for every $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $a \in S^m, b \in S^n$, a and b are independent over $\text{acl}(Aa) \cap \text{acl}(Ab)$.*
2. *A type is 1-based if the set of its realizations is 1-based.*

Proposition 1.2.4 ([36])

1. *The union of 1-based sets is 1-based.*
2. *If $tp(a/A)$ and $tp(b/Aa)$ are 1-based, so is $tp(a, b/A)$.*

Definition 1.2.5 *Let $p \in S(A)$. We say that p is regular if p is orthogonal to all its forking extensions.*

Proposition 1.2.6 (5.2.12 of [35])

Non almost-orthogonality over a set A is an equivalence relation on regular types over A .

Definition 1.2.7 Let $p, q \in S(A)$. We say that q is p -internal if for every realization a of q there is a set B such that $B \perp_A a$ and a tuple c of realizations of p such that $a \in \text{dcl}(Bc)$. A set X definable over A is p -internal if for every tuple a of X , $\text{tp}(a/A)$ is p -internal. If we replace dcl by acl above we say that q (or X) is almost p -internal.

Definition 1.2.8 Let $p, q \in S(A)$. We say that q is p -analyzable if there is a realization a of q , an ordinal κ and $(a_i)_{i < \kappa} \subset \text{dcl}(A, a)$ such that $\text{tp}(a_i/A \cup \{a_j : j < i\})$ is p -internal for all $i < \kappa$.

Definition 1.2.9 Let p and q be two complete types. We say that q is hereditarily orthogonal to p if every extension of q is orthogonal to p .

Remark 1.2.10 If $\text{tp}(a/A)$ is nonorthogonal to $p \in S(A)$ then $\text{acl}(Aa)$ contains a p -internal set: Let b realize p , B such that $a \perp_A B$, $b \perp_A B$ and $b \not\perp_B a$. Then $Cb(Bb/Aa)$ realizes a p -internal type over A .

Let A_p denote the maximal algebraic closed subset of $\text{acl}(Aa)$ such that $\text{tp}(A_p/A)$ is almost p -internal. If b realizes p then $a \perp_{A_p} b$, and therefore $a \not\perp_A b$ implies $A_p \not\perp_A b$.

Definition 1.2.11 Let $p \in S(A)$ be regular and let q be a type over a set $X \supset A$. We say that q is p -simple if there is $B \supset X$ and a set Y of realizations of p and a realization a of q with $a \perp_X B$ such that $\text{tp}(a/BY)$ is hereditarily orthogonal to p .

Definition 1.2.12 Let p be a (possibly partial) type over A and $q = \text{tp}(a/B)$ a type. The p -weight of q , denoted by $w_p(q)$, is the largest integer n such that there are $C \supset A \cup B$, a tuple $a_1, \dots, a_n$ of realisations of p which are independent over C , and a realisation b of q such that $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \perp_A C$, $b \perp_B C$ and $a_i \not\perp_C b$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. If p is the partial type $x = x$ we say weight instead of p -weight and it is denoted by $w(q)$.

Definition 1.2.13 Let A, B and C be sets. We say that A dominates B over C if for every set D , $D \perp_C A$ implies $D \perp_C B$. Let p, q be two types. We say that p dominates q if there is a set C containing the domains of p and q and realizations a and b of non forking extensions of p and q to C respectively, such that a dominates b over C . We say that p and q are equidominant if p dominates q and q dominates p .

Remark 1.2.14 Equidominance is an equivalence relation between regular types.

Remark 1.2.15 Let $A \perp_B C$, and let $p \in S(A)$, $q \in S(B)$ and $r \in S(C)$ be regular types. By the independence theorem, if $p \not\perp q$ and $q \not\perp r$ then $p \not\perp r$.

Remark 1.2.16 If $p \not\perp q$ and $q \not\perp r$ then there is a conjugate r' of r such that $p \not\perp r'$.

Definition 1.2.17 Let $p_1, \dots, p_n$ be types over a set A . The product $p_1 \times \dots \times p_n$ is the partial type of n independent realizations of $p_1, \dots, p_n$ over A .

Proposition 1.2.18 A type in a supersimple theory is equidominant with a finite product of regular types.

Definition 1.2.19 Let p be a regular type over A and let q be a p -simple type. We say that q is p -semi-regular if it is domination equivalent to a non-zero power of p .

Definition 1.2.20 Let p be a type and A a set. The p -closure of A , $cl_p(A)$ is the set of all a such that $tp(a/A)$ is p -analysable and hereditarily orthogonal to p .

Definition 1.2.21 A type p is called locally modular if for any A containing the domain of p , and any tuples a and b of realizations of p , we have $a \perp_C b$ where $C = cl_p(Aa) \cap cl_p(Ab)$.

Remark 1.2.22 In the definition of local modularity we can replace cl_p by the following p -closure: define $cl'_p(A)$ as the set of all a such that $tp(a/A)$ is hereditarily orthogonal to p .

Indeed, let a and b be as in the definition of local modularity, let $c_0 = cl_p(a) \cap cl_p(b)$ and $c_1 = cl'_p(a) \cap cl'_p(b)$. Then $Cb(a, b, c_0/c_1)$ realises a p -internal type over c_0 (since it is contained in the algebraic closure over c_0 of realisations of $tp(a, b)$), and therefore it is contained in $cl_p(c_0) = c_0$. Thus $ab \perp_{c_0} c_1$, and because $a \perp_{c_1} b$ and $a \perp_{c_0} c_1$, this implies that $a \perp_{c_0} b$.

Proposition 1.2.23 A type p is locally modular if and only if for any two models M and N with $N \prec M$, and any tuple of realizations a of p over M such that $tp(a/N)$ is p -semi-regular, $Cb(a/M) \subset cl_p(Na)$.

Lemma 1.2.24 Let $q = tp(a, b)$ be a regular type and $p = tp(b)$. Then p is locally modular if and only if q is locally modular.

Proof:

As being hereditarily orthogonal to p is the same as being hereditarily orthogonal to q , by definition for any set B , $cl'_p(B) = cl'_q(B)$.

Let (a_1, b_1) and (a_2, b_2) be tuples (of tuples) of realisations of q . By regularity of q , $a_i \in cl'_p(b_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$, so that

$$cl'_q(a_1, b_1) \cap cl_q(a_2, b_2) = cl'_p(b_1) \cap cl'_p(b_2) =_{\text{def}} C.$$

It follows immediately that the local modularity of q implies the local modularity of p . Conversely, assume that p is locally modular. Then $b_1 \perp_C b_2$. Let $D = Cb(a_1 b_1 / acl(Cb_2))$. Then $tp(D/C)$ is almost-internal to the set of conjugates of $tp(a_1 / Cb_1)$, and is therefore hereditarily orthogonal to p . Hence $D \subset cl'_p(C) = C$, and $a_1 b_1 \perp_C b_2$. A similar reasoning gives that $Cb(a_2 b_2 / acl(Ca_1 b_1)) \subset C$.

□

Lemma 1.2.25 Let T be a supersimple theory which eliminates imaginaries, $A = acl(A)$ a subset of some model M of T and a a tuple in M . Assume that $tp(a/A)$ has SU -rank $\beta + \omega^\alpha = \beta \oplus \omega^\alpha$ and has weight 1. Then there is $b \in acl(Aa)$ such that $SU(b/A) = \omega^\alpha$.

Proof:

By 1.2.2, there is some $C = \text{acl}(C) \supset A$ independent from a over A and a tuple c such that $SU(c/C) = \omega^\alpha$, and c and a are not independent over C . Let B be the algebraic closure of $Cb(Cc/\text{acl}(Aa))$. Then B is contained in the algebraic closure of finitely many (independent over Aa) realisations of $tp(Cc/\text{acl}(Aa))$, say $C_1c_1, \dots, C_nc_n$. Let $D = \text{acl}(C_1, \dots, C_n)$. Then D is independent from a over A , and each c_i is not independent from a over D . Since $tp(a/A)$ has weight 1, so does $tp(a/D)$, and therefore for each $1 < i \leq n$, c_1 and c_i are not independent over D . Thus $SU(c_i/Dc_1) < \omega^\alpha$, and therefore $SU(c_1, \dots, c_n/D) < \omega^{\alpha+2}$. As D is independent from a over A , and $B \subset \text{acl}(D, c_1, \dots, c_n) \cap \text{acl}(Aa)$, we get $SU(B/A) < \omega^{\alpha+2}$. Since $SU(c/C) = \omega^\alpha$ and $SU(c/CB) < \omega^\alpha$, then $SU(B/C) \geq \omega^\alpha$, and as $B \perp_A C$ we have $SU(B/A) \geq \omega^\alpha$. By Lascar's inequalities 1.1.8 we have $SU(a/AB) + SU(B/A) \leq \beta + \omega^\alpha$. As $SU(B/A) \geq \omega^\alpha$ we have that $SU(B/A) = \delta + \omega^\alpha$ with $\delta \geq \omega^\alpha$ or $\delta = 0$, and $SU(B/A) < \omega^{\alpha+2}$ implies that $\delta = 0$.

□

1.3 ω -stable theories with an automorphism

Now we take a look at ω -stable theories with an automorphism. All this material is from [3].

Let T be an ω -stable $\mathcal{L}$ -theory which eliminates quantifiers and imaginaries. Let $\mathcal{L}_\sigma = \mathcal{L} \cup \{\sigma\}$, where σ is an 1-ary function symbol.

Definition 1.3.1 *Let M be a saturated model of T , and N a model of T . Let σ an automorphism of N . We say that σ is generic if for any algebraically closed structures $A, B \subset M$, and σ_1, σ_2 automorphisms of A and B respectively; if $(A, \sigma_1) \subset (N, \sigma)$ and $f : (A, \sigma_1) \rightarrow (B, \sigma_2)$ is an $\mathcal{L}_\sigma$ -embedding, then there is an $\mathcal{L}_\sigma$ -embedding $g : (B, \sigma_2) \rightarrow (N, \sigma)$ such that $g \circ f$ is the identity on A .*

We consider the theory T_0 whose models are the $\mathcal{L}_\sigma$ -structures of the form (M, σ) , where M is a model of T and σ is an $\mathcal{L}$ -automorphism of M . We denote by T_1 the $\mathcal{L}_\sigma$ -theory of models of T_0 where σ is generic.

Theorem 1.3.2 *Assume that T_0 has a model-companion T_A .*

1. $T_A = T_1$, and $(M, \sigma) \models T_A$ if and only if (M, σ) is generic.
2. If (M_1, σ_1) and (M_2, σ_2) are models of T_A containing a common algebraically closed substructure (A, σ) , then $(M_1, \sigma_1) \equiv_A (M_2, \sigma_2)$.

Let (M, σ) be a saturated model of T_A , and let $A \subset M$. We denote by $\text{acl}_\sigma(A)$ the algebraic closure in the sense of T of $(\dots, \sigma^{-1}(A), A, \sigma(A), \dots)$.

Proposition 1.3.3 *Assume T_A exists and (M, σ) is a model of T_A . Then*

1. $\text{acl}(A) = \text{acl}_\sigma(A)$.
2. Let $(N_1, \sigma_1), (N_2, \sigma_2)$ be two submodels of (M, σ) containing a common structure E . Then $N_1 \equiv_E N_2$ if and only if $(\text{acl}(E), \sigma_1) \simeq (\text{acl}(E), \sigma_2)$.
3. Every completion of T_A is supersimple, and independence is given by: $A \perp_C B$ if and only if $\text{acl}_\sigma(AC)$ and $\text{acl}_\sigma(BC)$ are independent over $\text{acl}_\sigma(C)$ in the sense of the theory T .

Definition 1.3.4 Let T be a first order theory. We say that T is quantifier-free ω -stable if for any saturated model M of T , there are only countably many quantifier free types over a countable set.

Remark 1.3.5 Let T be an ω -stable theory which eliminates quantifiers and imaginaries, and let σ be an automorphism of a model M of T .

Let $A = \text{acl}(A) \subset M$ and let $a \in M$. Then $\text{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_\sigma}(a/A)$ is entirely determined by $\text{tp}_T((\sigma^i(a))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}/A)$. Let $B = \text{dcl}_T(A, \sigma^{-i}(a) \mid i > 0)$, and consider $\text{tp}_T(a/B)$. As T is ω -stable, there is some integer n such that $\text{tp}_T(a/B)$ is the unique non-forking extension of $\text{tp}_T(a/A, \sigma^{-1}(a), \dots, \sigma^{-n}(a))$ to B . Applying σ^i , this gives that $\text{tp}_T(\sigma^i(a)/\sigma^i(B))$ is the unique non-forking extension of $\text{tp}_T(\sigma^i(a)/A, \sigma^{i-1}(a), \dots, \sigma^{i-n}(a))$ to $\sigma^i(B)$. This implies that T_0 is quantifier-free- ω -stable (and so are T_1 and T_A).

Remark 1.3.6 Definition of canonical bases of quantifier-free types. Assume that T is ω -stable and T_A exists. Since forking in T_A is witnessed by quantifier-free formulas (see 1.3.3.3), any completion of T_A is supersimple, and $\text{tp}_{T_A}(a/A)$ does not fork over C , where C is the canonical base (in the sense of T) of $\text{tp}_T((\sigma^i(a))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}/A)$. If T is an ω -stable theory one easily check that $C = \text{dcl}_T(\sigma^i(c) \mid i \in \mathbb{Z})$, where $c = \text{Cb}(\text{tp}_T(\sigma^i(a), \sigma^{i-1}(a), \dots, \sigma^{i-n}(a))/A)$ for some n as in 1.3.5. So we will define the canonical base of $\text{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_\sigma}(a/A)$ to be this set C , and denote it by $\text{Cb}(\text{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_\sigma}(a/A))$. Note that $\text{Cb}(\text{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_\sigma}(a/A))$ does not coincide with the canonical base of $\text{tp}_{T_A}(a/A)$ as defined for simple theories. However, if T_A satisfies the independence theorem over algebraically closed sets, then the canonical base of $\text{tp}_{T_A}(a/A)$ will be contained in $\text{acl}(\text{Cb}(\text{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_\sigma}(a/A)))$.

1.4 ω -Stable Groups

We mention some facts and important definitions on ω -stable groups. For more details on this subject the reader may consult [28], [31] or [34].

Throughout this section G will be an ω -stable group, that is a group with possibly extra structure, such that the theory of the group with this structure is ω -stable. We will often assume that G is $\emptyset$ -definable. We point out that some of the results listed here hold for stable groups.

An important property of ω -stable groups is the chain condition.

Proposition 1.4.1 *There is no infinite strictly decreasing sequence of definable subgroups of G . In particular, the intersection of any set of definable subgroups is equal to the intersection of finitely many of them, and thus is definable.*

If we consider now the class of definable subgroups of finite index in G , their intersection is definable, thus there is a unique smallest definable subgroup of G of finite index. We say that a definable group is connected if it has no proper definable subgroup of finite index. We call the intersection of all definable subgroups of G of finite index the connected component of G and we denote it by G^0 . As an immediate consequence we have that, if G is connected and H is a normal definable subgroup of G , then G/H is connected.

We can define an action of G on the space of types over G as follows: let $p \in S(G)$ and let $g \in G$. Then $g \cdot p = \{\varphi(x) : \varphi(x) \text{ is a formula with parameters in } G, \varphi(gx) \in p\}$.

Definition 1.4.2 *Let G be an ω -stable group. Let $p \in S(G)$. The left stabilizer of p is $\text{Stab}(p) = \{g \in G : g \cdot p = p\}$.*

If G is defined over A , and $a \in G$ is such that $p = \text{tp}(a/A)$ is stationary, the left stabilizer of p is $\text{Stab}(p) = \{g \in G : \text{for some } a' \text{ realizing the non-forking extension of } p \text{ to } A \cup \{g\}, \text{tp}(g \cdot a'/A) = p\}$

Clearly $\text{Stab}(p)$ is a subgroup of G , and it is definable.

We define now generic types of ω -stable groups.

Definition 1.4.3 *Let $\alpha = \text{RM}(G)$, where RM denotes the Morley rank. Let A be some set of parameters, and let $p \in S(A)$. We say that p is a generic type of G over A if $(x \in G) \in p$ and $\text{RM}(p) = \alpha$.*

ω -stable groups always have generic types. If p is a type over A and q is a non-forking extension of p to $B \supset A$, then p is a generic type of G over A if and only if q is a generic type of G over B . Let $a \in G$. Then $\text{tp}(a/A)$ is a generic of G if and only if $\text{tp}(a^{-1}/A)$ is a generic of G .

Lemma 1.4.4 *Let $a \in G$. Then $\text{tp}(a/A)$ is a generic type of G if and only if for any $b \in G$ independent from a over A , $a \cdot b$ is independent from b over A , if and only if $b \cdot a$ is independent from b over A .*

This is why we can talk about generics instead of left generics and right generics.

Proposition 1.4.5 *If G is connected then it has a unique generic type. In particular any ω -stable group G has finitely many generic types, and these types correspond to the cosets of G^0 in G .*

Lemma 1.4.6 *Let $p(x) \in S(A)$ be a stationary type containing $x \in G$. Define $H = \text{Stab}(p)$. Let $a \in G$ and b realize the non-forking extension of $p(x)$ to $A \cup \{a\}$. Then $\text{tp}(a \cdot b/Aa)$ is stationary and aH , as an imaginary, is interdefinable over A with $\text{Cb}(\text{stp}(a \cdot b/Aa))$.*

Lemma 1.4.7 *Let $c \in G$ such that $p = tp(c/A)$ is stationary. Let $H = \text{Stab}(p)$ and let $a \in G$ be a generic over $A \cup \{c\}$. Then Hc , as an imaginary, is interdefinable with $Cb(stp(a/A, c \cdot a))$ over $A \cup \{a\}$*

We end this section with a remarkable result on 1-based stable groups, due to Hrushovski and Pillay ([11]).

Theorem 1.4.8 *G is 1-based if and only if, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, every definable subset of G^n is a finite Boolean combination of cosets of definable subgroups of G^n .*

1.5 Definable Groups in Supersimple Theories

Throughout this section T will be a supersimple theory, M a saturated model of T , and G an ∞ -definable (definable by an infinite number of formulas) group over some set of parameters $A \subset M$. Since in simple theories we do not have Morley rank, we will use the equivalence 1.4.4 to define generic types. We refer to [26] for the proofs. Some of the results in this section hold for groups definable in simple theories.

Definition 1.5.1 *Let $p \in S(A)$. We say that p is a left generic type of G over A if it is realized in G and for every $a \in G$ and b realizing p such that $a \perp_A b$, we have $b \cdot a \perp_A a$.*

Some of the properties of generic types in ω -stable groups hold in simple theories.

Fact 1.5.2 *Let G be an A -definable group.*

1. *Let $a, b \in G$. If $tp(a/Ab)$ is left generic of G , then so is $tp(b \cdot a/Ab)$.*
2. *Let $p \in S(A)$ be realized in G , $B = \text{acl}(B) \supset A$, and $q \in S(B)$ a non-forking extension of p . Then p is a generic of G if and only if q is a generic of G .*
3. *Let $tp(a/A)$ be generic of G ; then so is $tp(a^{-1}/A)$.*
4. *There exists a generic type of G .*
5. *A type is left generic if and only if it is right generic.*

Definition 1.5.3 *Let $p \in S(A)$. $S(p) = \{g \in G : gp \cup p \text{ does not fork over } A\}$.*

Equivalently, $a \in S(p)$ if and only if there are realizations b, c of p , each one independent from a over A , such that $c = a \cdot b$. This implies in particular that $a^{-1} \in S(p)$.

Definition 1.5.4 *Assume that T satisfies the independence theorem over A . Let p be type over A . We define the stabilizer of p by $\text{Stab}(p) = S(p)S(p)$.*

Theorem 1.5.5 *$\text{Stab}(p)$ is an ∞ -definable subgroup of G , and p is a generic type of G if and only if $\text{Stab}(p)$ is of bounded index in G .*

Remark 1.5.6 *In the stable case, $S(p) = \text{Stab}(p)$.*

The following is a consequence of 1.1.8.

Proposition 1.5.7 *Let G be a $\emptyset$ -definable group, H a $\emptyset$ -definable subgroup of G and let $A = \text{acl}(A)$,*

1. *Let $p \in S(A)$, then p is a generic of G over A if and only if $SU(G) = SU(p)$.*
2. *$SU(G) = SU(H)$ if and only if $[H : G] < \infty$.*
3. *$SU(H) + SU(G/H) \leq SU(G) \leq SU(H) \oplus SU(G/H)$.*

1.6 Differential Fields

In this section we introduce the basic notions of differential algebra and the theory of differentially closed fields. Even if some of the results hold in all characteristics we shall work in fields of characteristic zero. We will work in the language $\mathcal{L}_D = \{0, 1, +, -, \cdot, D\}$, where D is a 1-ary function symbol.

For algebraic results the references are to [13] and [16], for model-theoretic results see [21], [23] and [37].

Definition 1.6.1 *A differential ring is a commutative ring R , together with an operator D acting over R , such that, for every $x, y \in R$, we have:*

1. $D(x + y) = Dx + Dy$
2. $D(xy) = xDy + yDx$

If R is a field, we say that (R, D) is a differential field.

Definition 1.6.2 *Let (R, D) be a differential ring. The differential polynomial ring over R in n indeterminates is the ring $R[X]_D = R[X, DX, D^2X \cdots]$, where $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$.*

We extend D to $R[X_1, \dots, X_n]_D$ in the obvious way, it has then a natural structure of differential ring.

Definition 1.6.3 *Let $f \in K[X]_D$. The order of f , denoted by $\text{ord}(f)$, is the greatest integer n such that $D^n X$ appears in f with non-zero coefficient. If there is no such n we set $\text{ord}(f) = -1$.*

Differential ideals play a key role in the study of differential fields.

Definition 1.6.4 *Let (R, D) be a differential ring.*

1. *Let I be an ideal of R . We say that I is a differential ideal if it is closed under D .*

2. If $A \subset R$, we denote by $(A)_D$ the smallest differential ideal containing A , and by $\sqrt{(A)}_D$ the smallest radical differential ideal containing A .

Remark 1.6.5

1. The radical of a differential ideal is a differential ideal.
2. If I is a differential ideal of R , then R/I is a differential ring.

We have a Finite Basis Theorem for radical differential ideals of the ring of differential polynomials over a differential field.

Theorem 1.6.6 *Let (K, D) be a differential field, and I a radical differential ideal of $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]_D$. Then there is a finite subset A of I such that $I = \sqrt{(A)}_D$.*

This result fails for differential ideals which are not radical.

Corollary 1.6.7 *Let (K, D) be a differential ring. Then $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]_D$ satisfies the ascending chain condition on radical differential ideals.*

Definition 1.6.8 *Let (K, D) a differential ring and L a differential subring of K .*

1. Let $a \in K$. The differential ideal of a over L is $I_D(a/L) = \{f \in L[X]_D : f(a) = 0\}$. If $I_D(a/L) = 0$ we say that a is differentially transcendental (or D -transcendental) over L ; otherwise we say that it is differentially algebraic.
2. Let $a \in K^n$. The differential ideal of a over L is $I_D(a/L) = \{f \in L[X_1, \dots, X_n]_D : f(a) = 0\}$. If $I_D(a/L) = 0$ we say that a is differentially independent over L .

Notation 1.6.9 *Let (K, D) a differential field. Let $A \subset K^n$, and $S \subset K[X]_D$, with $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$.*

1. $I_D(A) = \{f \in K[X]_D : f(x) = 0 \ \forall x \in A\}$.
2. $V_D(S) = \{x \in K^n : f(x) = 0 \ \forall f \in S\}$.

Definition 1.6.10 *Let (K, D) be a differential field. We define the D -topology of K^n (also called Kolchin topology or Zariski differential topology), as the topology with the sets of the form $V_D(I)$ as basic closed sets, where $I \subset K[X_1, \dots, X_n]_D$ is a differential ideal.*

From 1.6.7 we deduce the following:

Corollary 1.6.11 *Let (K, D) be a differential field. Then the D -topology of K^n is Noetherian.*

A remarkable result in differential algebra is Kolchin's Irreducibility Theorem. Its proof can be found in [19], Chapter II, Appendix C.

Proposition 1.6.12 *Let (K, D) be a difference field, and let V be an irreducible algebraic variety defined over K . Then V is irreducible in the D -topology.*

Definition 1.6.13 *Let (K, D) be a differential field. We say that (K, D) is differentially closed if, for every $f, g \in K[X]_D$, such that the order of f is greater than the order of g , there is $a \in K$ such that $f(a) = 0$ and $g(a) \neq 0$.*

We denote the theory of differentially closed fields by DCF.

Remark 1.6.14 *DCF is the model-companion of the theory of differential fields. As a consequence we have that every differential field embeds in a model of DCF.*

Theorem 1.6.15 *Let (K, D) a difference field. Then (K, D) is a model of DCF if and only if it is existentially closed.*

Theorem 1.6.16 *The theory of differentially closed fields is complete and ω -stable; it eliminates quantifiers and imaginaries.*

As DCF is ω -stable, given a differential field (K, D) , DCF has a prime model over K . This prime model is unique up to K -isomorphism and is called the differential closure of (K, D) .

For any differential field (K, D) there is a distinguished definable subfield: the field of constants $\mathcal{C} = \{x \in K : Dx = 0\}$.

Theorem 1.6.17 *Let (K, D) be a model of DCF. Then its field of constants $\mathcal{C}$ is an algebraically closed field and has no other definable structure, that is, any definable subset of $\mathcal{C}^n$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is definable over $\mathcal{C}$ in the language of fields.*

Fact 1.6.18 *Let (K, D) be a model of DCF, $A \subset K$. The definable closure of A , $dcl_{DCF}(A)$, is the smallest differential field containing A , and equals the field generated by $(A)_D = (A, D(A), \dots)$.*

The algebraic closure of A , $acl_{DCF}(A)$, is $dcl_{DCF}(A)^{alg} = (A)_D^{alg}$, where $(A)^{alg}$ denotes the field-theoretic algebraic closure of the field generated by A .

For differentially closed fields we have a version of Hilbert's Nullstellensatz.

Theorem 1.6.19 *Let (K, D) be a model of DCF. Let I be a radical differential ideal of $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]_D$. Then $I_D(V_D(I)) = I$.*

Definition 1.6.20 *Let (K, D) be a differential field, and let V be a variety in the affine space of dimension n , let $F(X)$ be a finite tuple of polynomials over K generating $I(V)$, where $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$.*

1. *We define the first prolongation of V , $\tau_1(V)$ by the equations:*

$$F(X) = 0, J_F(X)Y_1^t + F^D(X) = 0$$

where Y_1 is an n -tuple, F^D denotes the tuple of polynomials obtained by applying D to the coefficients of each polynomial of F , and $J_F(X)$ is the Jacobian matrix of F (i.e. if $F = (F_1, \dots, F_k)$ then $J_F(X) = (\partial F_i / \partial X_j)_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq n}$).

2. For $m > 1$, we define the m -th prolongation of V by induction on m :

Assume that $\tau_{m-1}(V)$ is defined by $F(X) = 0$, $J_F(X)Y_1^t + F^D(X) = 0, \dots, J_F(X)Y_{m-1}^t + f_{m-1}(X, Y_1, \dots, Y_{m-2}) = 0$. Then $\tau_m(V)$ is defined by:

$$(X, Y_1, \dots, Y_{m-1}) \in \tau_{m-1}(V)$$

and

$$J_F(X)Y_m^t + J_F^D(X)Y_{m-1}^t + J_{f_{m-1}}(X, Y_1, \dots, Y_{m-2})(Y_1, \dots, Y_{m-1})^t + f_{m-1}^D(X, Y_1, \dots, Y_{m-2}) = 0.$$

3. Let $W \subset \tau_m(V)$ be a variety. We say that W is in normal form if, for every $i \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$, whenever $G(X, Y_1, \dots, Y_i) \in I(W) \cap K[X, Y_1, \dots, Y_i]$ then

$$J_G(X, Y_1, \dots, Y_i)(Y_1, \dots, Y_{i+1})^t + G^D(X, Y_1, \dots, Y_i) \in I(W).$$

4. Let $W \subset \tau_m(V)$ be a variety in normal form.

A point a (in some extension of K) is an (m, D) -generic of W over K if $(a, Da, \dots, D^m a)$ is a generic of W over K and for every $i > m$,

$$\text{tr.dg}(D^i a / K(a, \dots, D^{i-1} a)) = \text{tr.dg}(D^m a / K(a, \dots, D^{m-1} a)).$$

Remark 1.6.21

1. There is a natural projection from $\tau_m(V)$ onto $\tau_{m-1}(V)$.

2. The map $\rho : \tau_{m+1}(V) \rightarrow \tau_1(\tau_m(V))$ defined by

$(x, u_1, \dots, u_m) \mapsto ((x, u_1, \dots, u_{m-1}), (u_1, \dots, u_m))$, defines an isomorphism between $\tau_{m+1}(V)$ and a Zariski-closed subset of $\tau_1(\tau_m(V))$.

We give now a more geometric axiomatization of DCF due to Pierce and Pillay ([23]).

Theorem 1.6.22 *Let (K, D) be a differential field. K is differentially closed if and only if K is an algebraically closed field and for every irreducible algebraic variety V , if W is an irreducible algebraic subvariety of $\tau_1(V)$ such that the projection of W onto V is dominant, then there is $a \in V(K)$ such that $(a, Da) \in W$.*

We remark here that the axioms above hold just for the characteristic zero case. If K is characteristic p we must replace the condition of K being algebraically closed by: K is separably closed, and every constant is a p -th power.

The following lemma ([16], chapter X), gives us a condition for extending the derivation of a differential field.

Lemma 1.6.23 *Let (K, D) be a differential field and $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i \in I}$ a (possibly infinite) tuple in some extension of K . Let $\{F_j : j \in J\}$ be a set of generators of the ideal $I(\bar{a}/K) \subset K[X_i : i \in I]$.*

Let $(b_i)_{i \in I}$ be a tuple of $K(\bar{a})$ such that, for all $j \in J$

$$\sum_{i \in I} \frac{\partial F_j}{\partial X_i}(\bar{a}) b_i + F_j^D(\bar{a}) = 0.$$

Then D extends to a unique derivation D^* on $K(a_i : i \in I)$, such that $D^* a_i = b_i$ for all $i \in I$.

Lemma 1.6.24 *Let $D : K \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ be such that for all $a, b \in K$*

$$(*) D(a + b) = Da + Db$$

$$(**) D(ab) = aDb + bDa.$$

Let $a \in \mathcal{U}$.

1. *If a is transcendental over K , and $b \in \mathcal{U}$, then there is $D_1 : K(a) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ extending D and satisfying $(*)$ and $(**)$ such that $D_1 a = b$.*
2. *If a is algebraic over K , then there is a unique extension D_1 of D to $K(a)$ satisfying $(*)$ and $(**)$.*

Proof:

(1) For $f(a) \in K(a)$, set $D_1(f(a)) = f'(a)b + f^D(a)$. Since a is transcendental over K , one checks easily that $(*)$ and $(**)$ hold.

(2) Let $f(X) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i X^i$ be the monic minimal polynomial of a over K . We define $D_1 a = -f'(a)^{-1} f^D(a)$. Every element of $K(a)$ can be written $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} b_i a^i$ where the b_i are in K . We then set

$$D_1\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} b_i a^i\right) = -\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (D(b_i) a^i + i b_i D_1(a) a^{i-1}).$$

Clearly, D_1 satisfies $(*)$, and to check that it satisfies $(**)$, it suffices to show that $D_1(a^n) = n D_1(a) a^{n-1}$. Since $a^n = -\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i a^i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(a^n) &= -\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (D(a_i) a^i + i a_i D_1(a) a^{i-1}) \\ &= -f^D(a) - (f'(a) - n a^{n-1}) D_1(a) \\ &= n a^{n-1} D_1(a). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 1.6.25 *Let $(\mathcal{U}, D)$ be a saturated model of DCF, let $K = \text{acl}(K) \subset \mathcal{U}$, let V an irreducible affine variety, and W a subvariety of $\tau_m(V)$ both defined over K . If W is in normal form, then W has an (m, D) -generic in $\mathcal{U}$.*

Proof :

We will construct a differential field containing K , and which contains an (m, D) -generic of W . We work in some large algebraically closed field containing K , and choose a generic $(a, b_1, \dots, b_m)$ of W over K . Since W is in normal form, by 1.6.23 we define $D : K(a, b_1, \dots, b_{m-1}) \rightarrow K(a, b_1, \dots, b_m)$ by setting $Da = b_1$ and $Db_i = b_{i+1}$, and so that it satisfies $(*)$ and $(**)$. Let $v_m \subset D^m a$ be a transcendence basis of b_m over $K(a, b_1, \dots, b_{m-1})$ and let $(v_n)_{n>m}$ be a set of tuples of the same length as v_m such that for all $n > m$ the elements of v_n are algebraically independent over $K(a, b_1, \dots, b_m, v_{m+1}, \dots, v_{n-1})$. By 1.6.24, the map D on $K(a, b_1, \dots, b_{m-1})$ extends (uniquely) to a map D_1 defined on $L = K(a, b_1, \dots, b_m, v_n)_{n>m}$ which sends v_n to v_{n+1} for $n \geq m$ and satisfies $(*)$ and $(**)$. Then D_1 is a derivation of L , and a is an (m, D) -generic of W .

□

Corollary 1.6.26 *Let (K, D) be a differentially closed field. Let V a variety, and W a subvariety of $\tau_m(V)$ both defined over K . Then W is in normal form if and only if $\{(x, Dx, \dots, D^m x) : x \in V\} \cap W$ is Zariski dense in W . In particular $\{(x, Dx, \dots, D^m x) : x \in V\}$ is Zariski dense in $\tau_m(V)$ and $\dim(\tau_m(V)) = (m+1)\dim(V)$.*

Remark 1.6.27 *Let (K, D) be a differentially closed field and V a smooth variety in the affine space of dimension n defined over $E = \text{acl}_D(E) \subset K$. If $W \subset \tau_m(V)$ is a variety in normal form then all (m, D) -generics of W have the same type over E .*

We introduced varieties in normal form to bypass some difficulties concerning differential ideals.

Let $W \subset \tau_m(V)$ be a variety in normal form, and let $I \subset K[X, Y_1, \dots, Y_m]$ its defining ideal, which is a prime ideal. Let $\varphi : K[X, Y_1, \dots, Y_m] \rightarrow K[X]_D$ be the $K[X]$ -algebra embedding sending Y_i to $D^i X$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and let J be the differential ideal generated by $\varphi(I)$.

Let L be a sufficiently saturated differentially closed field containing K , and consider the set $\bar{W}$ defined by J . The set $\bar{W}$ may not be irreducible for the Kolchin topology. However, it will have an irreducible component W_0 with the following property: $I_D(W_0)$ is the unique prime differential ideal containing $\varphi(I)$ and whose intersection with $K[X, DX, \dots, D^m X]$ equals $\varphi(I)$. All points in the other irreducible components of W will satisfy some additional equations of order m . Furthermore, if a is a generic of W_0 over K in the sense of the Kolchin topology (i.e., W_0 is the smallest Kolchin closed set defined over K which contains a), then a will be an (m, D) -generic of W and conversely.

Thus to each variety in normal form defined over K is associated in a canonical way an irreducible Kolchin closed set defined over K (and therefore a unique complete type over K). The condition of a variety being in normal form is clearly expressible by first-order formulas on the coefficients of the defining polynomials, while it is not as immediate that the property of differential polynomials to generate a prime differential ideal is elementary in their coefficients.

Lemma 1.6.28 *Let (L, D) be a differential field, and let K be a differential subfield of L . Let a be a tuple of L , let $v \subset a$. If the elements of $D^{m+1}v$ are algebraically independent over $K(a, \dots, D^m a)$, then for all $i \in \{0, \dots, m\}$, the elements of $D^i v$ are algebraically independent over $K(a, \dots, D^{i-1} a)$ (or over K if $i = 0$).*

Proof:

By reverse induction on i it is enough to prove that the elements of $D^m v$ are algebraically independent over $K(a, \dots, D^{m-1} a)$.

If the elements of $D^m v$ are algebraically dependent over $K(a, \dots, D^{m-1} a)$, then there is a non zero polynomial $P(X) \in K(a, \dots, D^{m-1} a)[X]$ which is irreducible and vanishes at $D^m v$. Thus $J_P(D^m v)(D^{m+1} v)^t + P^D(D^m v) = 0$, and, as P is irreducible and we work in characteristic zero, $J_P(D^m v) \neq 0$. Then, since $P^D(D^m v) \in K(a, \dots, D^m a)$, $D^{m+1} v$ satisfies a non-trivial equation over $K(a, \dots, D^m a)$ which contradicts our assumption. Hence the elements of $D^m v$ are algebraically independent over $K(a, \dots, D^{m-1} a)$.

□

Corollary 1.6.29 *Let K be a differential subfield of (L, D) , let a be a tuple of L , let $d_{n+1} = \text{tr.dg}(K(a, \dots, D^{n+1} a)/K(a, \dots, D^n a))$. Then $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence.*

Proof:

Let $n \geq 0$. Then

$$d_{n+1} = \text{tr.dg}(D^{n+1} a/K(a, \dots, D^n a)) = \text{tr.dg}(D^{n+1} a/K(a, \dots, D^{n-1} a)(D^n a)),$$

and the latter, by 1.6.28 is less than or equal to $\text{tr.dg}(D^n a/K(a, \dots, D^n a)) = d_n$.

□

Remark 1.6.30 *Since d_n is a decreasing sequence in $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, there is $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d_n = d_M$ for all $n \geq M$. Thus a is an (M, D) -generic of the locus of $(a, Da, \dots, D^M a)$ over K .*

Lemma 1.6.31 *Let (K, D) a differential field and (L, D) an extension. Let b be a tuple of L .*

Assume that, for $i > 1$, $\text{tr.dg}(D^i b/K(b, Db, \dots, D^{i-1} b)) = \text{tr.dg}(Db/K(b))$. Let $a \in K(b)$ such that, for some $n > \text{tr.dg}(b/K(a))$ we have $\text{tr.dg}((Da, \dots, D^n a)/K(a)) = n \text{tr.dg}(Da/K(a))$.

Then $\text{tr.dg}((Da, \dots, D^i a)/K(a)) = i \text{tr.dg}(Da/K(a))$ for every $i > n$.

Proof:

We proceed by induction on $d = \text{tr.dg}(Da/K(a))$. It is clear for $d = 0$.

Let $v \subset Da$ be a transcendence basis for Da over $K(a)$. We can rewrite the hypothesis of the theorem as: the elements of $\{D^j v : 0 \leq j < n\}$ are algebraically independent

over $K(a)$. And we must prove that the elements of $\{D^j v : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are algebraically independent over $K(a)$.

Since $\text{tr.deg}(v, \dots, D^{n-1}v/K(a)) > \text{tr.deg}(b/K(a))$, $K(a, v, \dots, D^{n-1}v) \not\subset K(b)$. Let i be the smallest integer such that $D^i v \not\subset K(b)$; then $D^i v \subset K(b, Db)$. Let $w_0 \subset D^i v$ be a transcendence basis for $D^i v$ over $K(b)$, and let $w \supset w_0$ be a transcendence basis for Db over $K(b)$. Let $v_0 \subset v$ be such that $D^i v_0 = w_0$, let $a_0 \subset a$ be such that $Da_0 = v_0$ and let $v_1 = v \setminus v_0$.

Our hypothesis implies that $\{v, \dots, D^{n-1}v\}$ is a transcendence basis for $K(a, \dots, D^n a)$ over $K(a)$; so $\{v_1, \dots, D^{n-1}v_1\}$ is a transcendence basis for $K(a, \dots, D^n a)$ over $K(a, v_0, \dots, D^{n-1}v_0)$. Both fields are contained in $K(b, w, \dots, D^{n-i-1}w)$, thus the elements of $\{D^j w : j \geq n-i\}$ are algebraically independent over $K(a, \dots, D^n a)$, so $\text{tr.deg}(Da, \dots, D^n a/(K(a_0)_D(a)) = \text{tr.deg}(Da, \dots, D^n a/K(a, Da_0, \dots, D^n a_0)) = n \text{tr.deg}(Da/K(a, Da_0))$.

By induction hypothesis applied to a and $K(a_0)_D$, the elements of $\{D^j v_1 : j \geq 0\}$ are algebraically independent over $K(a_0)_D(a)$; thus the elements of $\{D^j v : j \geq 0\}$ are algebraically independent over $K(a)$, since $\text{tr.deg}(a_0, \dots, D^i a_0/K) = (i+1)\text{tr.deg}(a_0/K)$ for all $i > 0$.

□

Corollary 1.6.32 *Let $V, W, V_1 \subset \tau_1(V), W_1 \subset \tau_1(W)$ be irreducible varieties defined over a differentially closed field K . Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be a rational map. Then the following property is expressible in the first order language $\mathcal{L}_D$ with the parameters needed to define f, V, W, V_1, W_1 :*

V and W are smooth varieties, V_1 and W_1 are varieties in normal form, and a $(1, D)$ -generic of V_1 is sent by f to a $(1, D)$ -generic of W_1 .

Proof :

By the results in [33], we know that we can express in $\mathcal{L}_D$ that V is a smooth variety, $V_1 \subset \tau_1(V)$ is a variety in normal form, and that a rational map between two varieties sends generic points onto generic points. Using the characterization of varieties in normal form given in 1.6.20, for every $m \geq 0$ we can construct subvarieties $V_m \subset \tau_m(V)$ and $W_m \subset \tau_m(W)$ such that the (m, D) -generics of V_m are exactly the $(1, D)$ -generics of V_1 and similarly for W_m and W_1 . By 1.6.31 it suffices to say that the projection $W_m \rightarrow V_m$ is dominant, where $m = \dim(W) - \dim(V) + 1$.

□

As DCF is ω -stable, there is a notion of independence: Let (K, D) be a differentially closed field, let $A, B, C \subset K$. We say that A is independent from B over C if $\text{acl}_D(AC)$ and $\text{acl}_D(BC)$ are linearly disjoint over $\text{acl}_D(C)$.

An important result in the theory of differential fields is Zilber's dichotomy.

Theorem 1.6.33 *Let $(\mathcal{U}, D)$ be a differentially closed field and let $K \subset \mathcal{U}$. Let $p \in S(K)$ be a stationary type of U -rank 1. Then p is either 1-based or non-orthogonal to the field of constants.*

1.7 Difference Fields

In this section we mention basic facts and definitions about fields of characteristic 0 with an automorphism. As in the preceding section, some of the results that we recall here hold in any characteristic. For the model-theoretical statements we shall work in the language $\mathcal{L}_\sigma = \{0, 1, +, -, \cdot, \sigma\}$, where σ is a 1-ary function symbol.

For the proofs of the results in difference algebra the reader may consult [4], for model-theoretic results we refer to [2].

Definition 1.7.1 *A difference field is a field K together with a field endomorphism σ . If σ is an automorphism we say that (K, σ) is an inversive difference field.*

Fact 1.7.2 *Every difference field K embeds into a smallest inversive difference field, and this field is unique up to K isomorphism.*

From now on we assume all difference fields to be inversive.

Definition 1.7.3 *Let (K, σ) be a difference field. The difference polynomial ring over K in n indeterminates is the ring $K[X]_\sigma = K[X, \sigma(X), \sigma^2(X), \dots]$, where $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$.*

Remark 1.7.4 *We extend σ to $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]_\sigma$ in the obvious way. This map is injective but not surjective.*

Definition 1.7.5 *Let (K, σ) a difference field, $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$. Let I be an ideal of $K[X]_\sigma$. We say that I is a reflexive σ -ideal if for every $f \in K[X]_\sigma$, $f \in I$ if and only if $\sigma(f) \in I$. If, in addition, for every $f \in K[X]_\sigma$ and for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ $f^m \sigma(f)^n \in I$ implies $f \in I$, we say that I is a perfect σ -ideal.*

A prime ideal which is a perfect σ -ideal is called a prime σ -ideal.

Remark 1.7.6 *If I is a σ -ideal, then σ induces an endomorphism on $K[X]_\sigma/I$.*

Definition 1.7.7 *Let (K, σ) be a difference field and F a difference subfield of K (that is, F is a subfield of K and the restriction to F of σ is an automorphism of F). Let $a \in K$. We say that a is transformally transcendental (or σ -transcendental) over F if $I_\sigma(a/F) = \{f \in K[X]_\sigma : f(a) = 0\} = (0)$. Otherwise, we say that a is transformally algebraic over F .*

Notation 1.7.8 *Let (K, σ) be a difference field. Let $A \subset K^n$, and $S \subset K[X]_\sigma$ with $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$.*

1. $I_\sigma(A) = \{f \in K[X]_\sigma : f(x) = 0 \ \forall \ x \in A\}$.
2. $V_\sigma(S) = \{x \in K^n : f(x) = 0 \ \forall \ f \in S\}$.

Remark 1.7.9 *$I_\sigma(A)$ is a perfect σ -ideal.*

Proposition 1.7.10 $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]_\sigma$ satisfies the ascending chain condition on perfect σ -ideals.

Definition 1.7.11 Let (K, σ) a difference field. We define the σ -topology of K^n as the topology with the sets of the form $V_\sigma(S)$ as basic closed sets.

Corollary 1.7.12 Let (K, σ) be a difference field. Then the σ -topology of K^n is Noetherian.

Notation 1.7.13 Let (K, σ) be a difference field, and let V be an algebraic set defined over K . By V^σ we denote the algebraic set obtained by applying σ to the coefficients of the polynomials defining V .

Theorem 1.7.14 The theory of difference fields has a model-companion, that we shall denote by *ACFA*. It is described as follows.

$(K, \sigma) \models \text{ACFA}$ if and only if:

1. K is an algebraically closed field.
2. (K, σ) is a (inversive) difference field.
3. For every irreducible algebraic variety V , if W is an irreducible algebraic subvariety of $V \times V^\sigma$, such that the projections from W on V and V^σ are dominant, then there is $a \in V(K)$ such that $(a, \sigma(a)) \in W$.

As a direct consequence of the definition of model-companion we have that every difference field embeds in a model of *ACFA*.

Notation 1.7.15 Let (K, σ) a difference field, $A \subset K$. We denote by $(A)_\sigma$ the smallest difference field containing (A) , and by $\text{acl}_\sigma(A)$ the field-theoretic algebraic closure of $(A)_\sigma$.

Proposition 1.7.16 Let (K, σ) be a model of *ACFA*, and let $A \subset K$. Then $\text{acl}_{\text{ACFA}}(A) = \text{acl}_\sigma(A)$.

Proposition 1.7.17 *ACFA* is model-complete and eliminates imaginaries.

As in differential fields, we define independence in *ACFA* using independence in field theory, that is, if (K, σ) is a model of *ACFA*, and $A, B, C \subset K$, we say that A is independent of B over C if $\text{acl}_\sigma(AC)$ and $\text{acl}_\sigma(BC)$ are linearly disjoint from $\text{acl}_\sigma(C)$.

Proposition 1.7.18 All completions of *ACFA* are supersimple, independence coincides with non-forking.

For models of *ACFA* we have a version of Hilbert's Nullstellensatz.

Theorem 1.7.19 Let (K, σ) be a model of *ACFA*. Let I be a perfect σ -ideal of $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]_\sigma$. Then $I_\sigma(V_\sigma(I)) = I$.

As *ACFA* is supersimple every type is ranked by the *SU*-rank, and an element of a model of *ACFA* is σ -transcendental if and only if it has *SU*-rank ω .

If (K, σ) is a model of *ACFA*, there is a distinguished definable subfield of K : the fixed field $\text{Fix}\sigma = \{x \in K : \sigma(x) = x\}$.

Proposition 1.7.20 *$\text{Fix}\sigma$ is a pseudo-finite field. That is:*

1. *$\text{Fix}\sigma$ is perfect.*
2. *$\text{Gal}((\text{Fix}\sigma)^{\text{alg}}/\text{Fix}\sigma) = \hat{\mathbb{Z}}$.*
3. *$\text{Fix}\sigma$ is pseudo-algebraically closed (PAC).*

One of the consequences of this is that the definable field $\text{Fix}\sigma^n$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is the unique extension of $\text{Fix}\sigma$ of degree n . We have also that $\text{Fix}\sigma$ is the unique definable subfield of K of *SU*-rank 1, and that the *SU*-rank of $\text{Fix}\sigma^n$ is n .

Pseudo-finite fields are infinite models of the theory of finite fields. The theory of pseudo-finite fields is studied in [1] and [9].

Proposition 1.7.21 *$\text{Fix}\sigma$ is stably embedded; that is, every definable subset of $(\text{Fix}\sigma)^n$ is definable with parameters in $\text{Fix}\sigma$. Moreover it is definable in the pure language of fields.*

Proposition 1.7.22 *Let (K, σ) be a model of *ACFA*. Then, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, (K, σ^n) is a model of *ACFA*.*

As *DCF*, *ACFA* satisfies a version of Zilber's dichotomy.

Theorem 1.7.23 *Let $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma)$ be a saturated model of *ACFA* and let $K \subset \mathcal{U}$. Let $p \in S(K)$ be a type of *SU*-rank 1. Then p is either 1-based or non-orthogonal to the fixed field.*

Chapter 2

Difference-Differential Fields

This chapter is devoted to the study of difference-differential fields of characteristic zero, first we shall give the algebraic properties of such fields. In section two we give a proof of Hrushovski's theorem about the existence of a model-companion for the theory of difference-differential fields of characteristic zero, which we call *DCFA*. The original approach was to emulate the case of difference fields, the problem is that we cannot quantify on differential varieties but we can get around this using prolongations of differential varieties. We give also some properties of *DCFA*. Next we mention some properties of the fixed field and the field of constants of a model of *DCFA*. Finally we talk about forking and the *SU*-rank.

2.1 Difference-Differential Algebra

First we mention some facts concerning systems of ideals, see [5] for details.

Definition 2.1.1 *Let R be a commutative ring, and $\mathcal{C}$ a set of ideals of R .*

1. *We say that $\mathcal{C}$ is a conservative system of ideals if:*

(a) *For every $I \subset \mathcal{C}$, $\bigcap I \in \mathcal{C}$. $\bigcup I \in \mathcal{C}$.*

2. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a conservative system of ideals. We say that $\mathcal{C}$ is divisible if for $I \in \mathcal{C}$ and $a \in R$ we have $(I : a) \in \mathcal{C}$.*

3. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a divisible conservative system of ideals. We say that $\mathcal{C}$ is perfect if all its members are radical ideals.*

Theorem 2.1.2 ([5], section 2, Theorem I) *Let R be a commutative ring and $\mathcal{C}$ a perfect system of ideals, let $I \in \mathcal{C}$. Then I is an intersection of prime ideals of $\mathcal{C}$. If R is Noetherian this intersection can be taken to be a finite intersection.*

Definition 2.1.3 A difference-differential ring is a ring R together with a finite set of derivations $\Delta = \{D_1, \dots, D_m\}$ and a finite set of automorphisms $A = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$ such that all pairs in $\Delta \cup A$ commute.

If R is a field we say that (R, A, Δ) is a difference-differential field.

Let us denote by Θ the set of formal (commuting) products of elements of $A \cup \Delta$. Let (R, A, Δ) be a difference-differential ring. An ideal I of R is said to be a difference-differential ideal if it is closed under the operators of Θ .

The set of difference-differential ideals of R is conservative, but not necessarily divisible.

Definition 2.1.4 Let (R, A, Δ) be a difference-differential ring. Let I be a difference-differential ideal of R . We say that I is a perfect ideal if:

1. I is radical.
2. For every $a \in R$ and $\sigma \in A$, if $a\sigma(a) \in I$ then $a \in I$.

A theorem from [5] (pp.798-799) tells us that the set of perfect difference-differential ideals is perfect (in the sense of 2.1.1), and that it contains any perfect set of ideals.

Theorem 2.1.5 ([6], section 5, Corollary I) Let (S, A, Δ) be a difference-differential ring which contains $\mathbb{Q}$ and is such that the set of perfect difference-differential ideals of S satisfies the ascending chain condition. Let (R, A', Δ') be a difference-differential ring finitely generated over S as a difference-differential ring. Then the set of perfect difference-differential ideals of R satisfies the ascending chain condition.

From now on we will assume that we work in difference-differential rings with one derivation and one automorphism. We will often write (σ, D) instead of difference-differential (for example (σ, D) -ideal in place of difference-differential ideal).

Definition 2.1.6 Let (R, σ, D) be a difference-differential ring. The ring of difference-differential polynomials in n indeterminates over R is the ring $R[X]_{\sigma, D}$ of polynomials in the variables $\sigma^i(D^j X)$ for $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, where $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$.

As in the differential and difference cases, we can extend D to a derivation on $R[X]_{\sigma, D}$ and σ to an endomorphism of $R[X]_{\sigma, D}$ which commutes with D .

Remark 2.1.7 Let (R, σ, D) be a difference-differential ring. Let I be an ideal of R .

1. I is a (σ, D) -ideal if it is a differential ideal and a σ -ideal, in the sense of 1.6.4 and 1.7.5.
2. I is a perfect (σ, D) -ideal if it is a (σ, D) -ideal which is perfect as a σ -ideal.

Notation 2.1.8 Let (K, σ, D) a difference-differential field, $S \subset K[\bar{X}]_{\sigma, D}$, $A \subset K^n$; and let E be a difference-differential subfield of K , $a \in K^n$.

1. $V_{\sigma,D}(S) = \{\bar{x} \in K^n : \forall f(\bar{X}) \in S \ f(\bar{x}) = 0\}.$
2. $I_{\sigma,D}(A) = \{f(\bar{X}) \in K[\bar{X}]_{\sigma,D} : \forall \bar{x} \in A \ f(\bar{x}) = 0\}.$
3. $I_{\sigma,D}(a/E) = \{f(\bar{X}) \in E[\bar{X}]_{\sigma,D} : f(\bar{a}) = 0\}.$

We define the (σ, D) -topology of K^n to be the topology with the sets of the form $V_{\sigma,D}(S)$ as a basis of closed sets.

Remark 2.1.9 Let (K, σ, D) be a difference-differential field, $A \subset K^n$. Then $I_{\sigma,D}(a/E)$ is a perfect (σ, D) -ideal.

Corollary 2.1.10 Let (K, σ, D) be a difference-differential field. Then, by 2.1.5 the (σ, D) -topology of K^n is Noetherian.

Corollary 2.1.11 Let (K, σ, D) be a difference-differential field and let I be a perfect (σ, D) -ideal of $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]_{\sigma,D}$. Then I , as a (σ, D) -perfect ideal, is generated by a finite number of (σ, D) -polynomials.

Corollary 2.1.12 Let (K, σ, D) be a difference-differential field and let I be a perfect (σ, D) -ideal of $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]_{\sigma,D}$. Then I is a finite intersection of prime perfect (σ, D) -ideals.

2.2 The Model-Companion

We begin this section with Hrushovski's theorem on the existence of a model-companion for the theory of difference-differential fields of characteristic zero. In the axiom scheme that we give we try to emulate somewhat the axioms for *ACFA*.

Theorem 2.2.1 (*Hrushovski*)

The model companion of the theory of difference-differential fields exists. We denote it by DCFA and it is described as follows:

(K, D, σ) is a model of DCFA if

1. *(K, D) is a differentially closed field.*
2. *σ is an automorphism of (K, D) .*
3. *If U, V, W are varieties such that:*
 - (a) *$U \subset V \times V^\sigma$ projects generically onto V and V^σ .*
 - (b) *$W \subset \tau_1(U)$ projects generically onto U .*
 - (c) *$\pi_1(W)^\sigma = \pi_2(W)$ (we identify $\tau_1(V \times V^\sigma)$ with $\tau_1(V) \times \tau_1(V)^\sigma$ and let $\pi_1 : \tau_1(V \times V^\sigma) \rightarrow \tau_1(V)$ and $\pi_2 : \tau_1(V \times V^\sigma) \rightarrow \tau_1(V)^\sigma$ be the natural projections).*

- (d) A $(1, D)$ -generic point of W projects onto a $(1, D)$ -generic point of $\pi_1(W)$ and onto a $(1, D)$ -generic point of $\pi_2(W)$.

Then there is a tuple $a \in V(K)$, such that $(a, Da, \sigma(a), \sigma(Da)) \in W$.

Proof:

By 1.6.32, these are first order properties. First we prove that any difference-differential field embeds in a model of $DCFA$. By quantifier elimination in DCF any difference-differential field embeds into a model of (1) and (2). By the usual model-theoretic argument, it suffices to show that any instance of (3) over a difference-differential field (K, σ, D) can be realized in an extension of (K, σ, D) .

Let (K, σ, D) be a difference-differential field such that $K \models ACF$. Let U, V, W be K -varieties satisfying (3). Let $(\mathcal{U}, D)$ be a saturated model of DCF containing (K, D) . Let (a, b) be a $(1, D)$ -generic of W over K ; then a is a $(1, D)$ -generic of $\pi_1(W)$ over K and b is a $(1, D)$ -generic of $\pi_1(W)^\sigma$ over K . Hence $tp_{DCF}(b/K) = \sigma(tp_{DCF}(a/K))$; thus σ extends to an automorphism σ' of $(\mathcal{U}, D)$ such that $\sigma'(a) = b$.

Now we shall prove that the models of $DCFA$ are existentially closed. Let (K, σ, D) be a model of $DCFA$ contained in a difference-differential field $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$. Since $x \neq 0 \leftrightarrow \exists y xy = 1$, it suffices to prove that every finite system of (σ, D) -polynomial equations over K with a solution in $\mathcal{U}$ has a solution in K . Let $\varphi(x)$ be such a system and let a be a tuple of $\mathcal{U}$ satisfying φ . Since σ is an automorphism, φ is a finite conjunction of equations of the form $f(x, \dots, \sigma^n(x)) = 0$, where f is a differential polynomial; such an equation is equivalent, modulo the theory of difference-differential fields, to a formula of the form:

$$\exists y_0, \dots, y_{k-1} f(y_0, \dots, y_{k-1}, \sigma(y_{k-1})) = 0 \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k-1} (y_i = \sigma(y_{i-1}) \wedge y_0 = x).$$

Thus, if we replace x by $(y_0, \dots, y_{k-1})$ and a by $(a, \dots, \sigma^{k-1}(a))$, we may suppose that φ is a finite conjunction of equations of the form $g(x, \sigma(x)) = 0$, where $g(X, Y)$ is a differential polynomial over K .

Let m be sufficiently large so that X and Y appear in each $g(X, Y)$ with differential order less than m , and such that, for $M > m$

$$\begin{aligned} tr.dg((D^{M+1}a, D^{M+1}\sigma(a))/K(a, \sigma(a), \dots, D^M a, D^M \sigma(a))) = \\ tr.dg((D^m a, D^m \sigma(a))/K(a, \sigma(a), \dots, D^{m-1} a, D^{m-1} \sigma(a))) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$tr.dg(D^{M+1}a/K(a, \dots, D^M a)) = tr.dg(D^m a/K(a, \dots, D^{m-1} a))$$

Let V be the locus of $b = (a, Da, \dots, D^m a)$ over K , U the locus of $(b, \sigma(b))$ over K , and let $W \subset \tau_1(V \times V^\sigma)$ be the locus of $(b, Db, \sigma(b), \sigma(Db))$ over K . By construction and choice of m , b is a $(1, D)$ -generic of $\pi_1(W)$, $\sigma(b)$ is a $(1, D)$ -generic of $\pi_2(W)$ and $(b, \sigma(b))$ is a $(1, D)$ -generic of W . By axiom (3) there is a tuple $c = (c_0, \dots, c_m)$ in K such that

$(c, Dc, \sigma(c), \sigma(Dc)) \in W$. Thus $(c_0, \sigma(c_0))$ satisfies all the equations of differential order less than or equal to m satisfied by $(a, \sigma(a))$; hence c_0 satisfies $\varphi(x)$.

□

Example 2.2.2 *The following shows why we need the $(1, D)$ -generics in our axioms, generics are not strong enough to describe differential types. Consider the set A defined by the equations $\sigma(x) = Dx$ and $D\sigma(x) = x^2$. It is then given by a subvariety $W \subset \tau(\mathbb{A}^1) \times \tau(\mathbb{A}^1)$ given by the equations $x_2 = y_1$ and $x_1^2 = y_2$. The variety W projects on each copy of $\tau(\mathbb{A}^1)$.*

Let $a \in A, a \neq 0$. From $\sigma(a) = Da$ one deduces that $\sigma^i D^j a = \sigma^{i+j} a = D^{i+j} a$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $\sigma^3(a) = (Da)^2 = 2aDa$, which implies that $Da = 2a$. Thus there are differential relations that cannot be seen from the defining equations.

Remark 2.2.3 *If (K, D, σ) is a model of DCFA then (K, σ) is a model of ACFA .*

Proof :

Take $W = \tau_1(U)$, and apply 2.2.1.

□

For DCFA we have a version of Hilbert's Nullstellensatz.

Proposition 2.2.4 *Let (K, σ, D) be a model of DCFA , and I a perfect (σ, D) -ideal. Then $I_{\sigma, D}(V(I)) = I$*

Proof :

Clearly $I \subset I_{\sigma, D}(V(I))$. Let $f \in K[X]_{\sigma, D}$, such that $f \notin I$. By 2.1.12, there is a prime perfect (σ, D) -ideal J containing I such that $f \notin J$. Then $K[\bar{X}]_{\sigma, D}/J$ embeds into a difference-differential field L .

By 2.1.11, J is generated by a finite tuple of polynomials $P(X)$. Let $\bar{a}$ be the image of $\bar{X}$ in L . Thus we have that $L \models P(\bar{a}) = 0$ and $L \models f(\bar{a}) \neq 0$. Since (K, σ, D) is existentially closed there is $\bar{b} \in K$ such that $P(\bar{b}) = 0$ and $f(\bar{b}) \neq 0$. But $I \subset J$, thus $\bar{b} \in V(I)$, which implies $f \notin I_{\sigma, D}(V(I))$

□

Definition 2.2.5 *Let $E \subseteq F$ be two difference-differential fields, let $a \in F$.*

1. *We define $\deg_{\sigma, D}(a/E)$ to be the transcendence degree of $E(a)_{\sigma, D}$ over E if it is finite, in this case we say that a is finite-dimensional; otherwise we set $\deg_{\sigma, D}(a/E) = \infty$ and we say that a has infinite dimension.*
2. *If $I_{\sigma, D}(a/E) = (0)$ we say that a is (σ, D) -transcendental over E , otherwise we say that it is (σ, D) -algebraic over E .*

Remark 2.2.6 *If a is (σ, D) -algebraic over E it is not always true that $\deg_{\sigma, D}(a/E)$ is finite.*

Remark 2.2.7 *There is a natural notion of (σ, D) -transcendence basis.*

We mention some consequences of the results of Chapter 1, section 1.3.

Fact 2.2.8 *Let K_1, K_2 be models of DCFA, let E an algebraically closed difference-differential subfield of K_1 and K_2 . Then $K_1 \equiv_E K_2$.*

Corollary 2.2.9 *Let E be an algebraically closed difference-differential field, then $DCFA \cup \text{qfDiag}(E)$ is complete, where $\text{qfDiag}(E)$ denotes the set of quantifier-free formulas φ with parameters from E which are true in E .*

Corollary 2.2.10 *Let $(K_1, \sigma_1), (K_2, \sigma_2)$ be two models of DCFA containing a common difference-differential field (E, σ) . Then $K_1 \equiv_E K_2$ if and only if $(E^{\text{alg}}, \sigma_1) \simeq_E (E^{\text{alg}}, \sigma_2)$.*

Notation 2.2.11 *Let (K, σ, D) be a differential-difference field, $A \subset K$. We denote by $\text{cl}_{\sigma, D}(A)$ the smallest difference-differential field containing A , and by $\text{acl}_{\sigma, D}(A)$, the field-theoretic algebraic closure of $\text{cl}_{\sigma, D}(A)$.*

Corollary 2.2.12 *Let E be a difference-differential subfield of a model K of DCFA. Let a, b be tuples of K . Then $\text{tp}(a/E) = \text{tp}(b/E)$ if and only if there is an E -isomorphism between $\text{acl}_{\sigma, D}(E(a))$ and $\text{acl}_{\sigma, D}(E(b))$ which sends a to b .*

Corollary 2.2.13 *Let $\phi(\bar{x})$ be a formula. Then, modulo DCFA, $\phi(\bar{x})$ is equivalent to a disjunction of formulas of the form $\exists \bar{y} \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, where ψ is quantifier free, and for every tuple $(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ in a difference-differential field K satisfying ψ , $\bar{b} \in \text{acl}_{\sigma, D}(\bar{a})$.*

Proposition 2.2.14 *Let (K, σ, D) be a model of DCFA. Let $A \subset K$. Then the (model-theoretic) algebraic closure $\text{acl}(A)$ of A is $\text{acl}_{\sigma, D}(A)$.*

As with differential and difference fields, we define independence in difference-differential fields.

Definition 2.2.15 *Let K be a model of DCFA, let A, B, C be subsets of K . We say that A is independent from B over C , denoted by $A \perp_C B$, if $\text{acl}(A, C)$ is linearly disjoint from $\text{acl}(B, C)$ over $\text{acl}(C)$.*

By 1.3.3.3 we have:

Theorem 2.2.16

1. *The independence relation defined above coincides with nonforking.*
2. *Every completion of DCFA is supersimple.*

As in *ACFA*, we have a stronger version of the independence theorem.

Theorem 2.2.17 *If $\mathcal{U}$ is a saturated model of *DCFA*, E an algebraically closed subset of $\mathcal{U}$, and $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2$ tuples in $\mathcal{U}$ such that:*

1. $tp(\bar{c}_1/E) = tp(\bar{c}_2/E)$.
2. $\bar{a} \perp_E \bar{c}_1$, $\bar{a} \perp_E \bar{b}$ and $\bar{b} \perp_E \bar{c}_2$.

Then there is $\bar{c}$ realizing $tp(\bar{c}_1/E \cup \bar{a}) \cup tp(\bar{c}_2/E \cup \bar{b})$ such that $\bar{c} \perp_E (\bar{a}, \bar{b})$.

Proof:

Let $\bar{c}$ be a realization of $tp(\bar{c}_1/E)$ such that $\bar{c} \perp_E (\bar{a}, \bar{b})$. Let $A = acl(E\bar{a})$, $B = acl(E\bar{b})$, $C = acl(E\bar{c})$. Let $\phi_1 : acl(E\bar{c}_1) \rightarrow C$ and $\phi_2 : acl(E\bar{c}_2) \rightarrow C$ two $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,D}(E)$ -isomorphisms such that $\phi_i(\bar{c}_i) = \bar{c}$.

Let $\sigma_0 = \sigma|_{(AB)^{alg}C}$. Since A is linearly disjoint from $acl(E\bar{c}_1)$ and from C over E , we can extend ϕ_1 to a $\mathcal{L}_D(A)$ -isomorphism ψ_1 between $acl(A\bar{c}_1)$ and $(AC)^{alg}(=acl_D(AC))$. Let $\sigma_1 = \psi_1\sigma\psi_1^{-1}$; σ_1 is an automorphism of $(AC)^{alg}$ and agrees with σ on A and C . By definition of σ_1 , ψ_1 is a $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,D}(A)$ -isomorphism between $(acl(A\bar{c}_1), \sigma)$ and $((AC)^{alg}, \sigma_1)$. In the same way we define $\psi_2 : acl(BC_2) \rightarrow (BC)^{alg}$ and $\sigma_2 \in Aut(BC)^{alg}$.

Let $L = (AB)^{alg}(AC)^{alg}(BC)^{alg}$ (which is a differential field that extends A, B, C). Let us suppose that there is an $\mathcal{L}_D$ -automorphism τ of L which extends $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2$. Let $(M, \tau', D) \models DCFA$ contain (L, τ, D) . Since τ extends σ_0 , by 2.2.8, we have $tp_M(AB/E) = tp_{\mathcal{U}}(AB/E)$; since τ extend σ_i , the ψ_i 's are difference-differential field isomorphisms. Applying 2.2.12 we have $tp_M(\bar{c}/A) = tp_{\mathcal{U}}(\bar{c}_1/A)$ and $tp_M(\bar{c}/B) = tp_{\mathcal{U}}(\bar{c}_1/B)$. Also $\bar{c} \perp_E (A, B)$. Hence to finish the proof, all we have to do is show the existence of such a τ . To do this, we will prove that σ_0, σ_1 have a unique extension τ_1 to $(AB)^{alg}(AC)^{alg}$, and that there is an extension τ_2 of τ_1, σ_2 to L (Note that these automorphisms will commute with D).

For the first part it is enough to show that $(AB)^{alg}C$ is linearly disjoint from $(AC)^{alg}$ over $(AB)^{alg}C \cap (AC)^{alg}$, and that σ_0 and σ_1 agree on $(AB)^{alg}C \cap (AC)^{alg}$. Similarly for the second part.

By Remark 2 of 1.9 in [2], we have

$$(AB)^{alg}C \cap (AC)^{alg} = AC \quad (*), \quad (AB)^{alg}(AC)^{alg} \cap (BC)^{alg} = BC \quad (**).$$

Since $(AC)^{alg}$ is Galois over AC it implies that $(AC)^{alg}$ and $(AB)^{alg}$ are linearly disjoint over AC ; as σ_0 and σ_1 both extend σ on AC , they are compatible. The same argument applies for the second part.

□

Remark 2.2.18 *As *DCF* is ω -stable, *DCFA* is quantifier-free ω -stable.*

Now we want to prove that *DCFA* eliminates imaginaries. We shall need some properties of the fundamental order for types in stable theories.

Recall that a type $p(x)$ over some set A *represents* the $\mathcal{L}$ -formula $\phi(x, y)$ if there is a tuple $a \in A$ such that $\phi(x, a) \in p(x)$. We denote by $\beta(p)$ the set of formulas represented by p . For convenience, we will define the fundamental order on types whose domain is algebraically closed, so that they are stationary (and definable by elimination of imaginaries in *DCF*).

Definition 2.2.19 *Let A and B be algebraically closed differential subfields of some model $(\mathcal{U}, D)$ of *DCF*, and let $p(x)$, $q(x)$ be types over A and B respectively. We write $p \leq_{fo} q$ if $\beta(q) \subseteq \beta(p)$, and $\beta(p) \sim_{fo} \beta(q)$ if $\beta(p) = \beta(q)$. $\leq_{fo}$ is called the fundamental order.*

Fact 2.2.20 *If $A \subset B$ and q is an extension of p , one has $q \leq_{fo} p$, and $q \sim_{fo} p$ if and only if q is a non-forking extension of p .*

If p and q are types in an infinite number of variables $(x_i)_{i \in I}$ we say that $p \leq_{fo} q$ if and only if for every finite $J \subset I$, if p' and q' denote the restrictions of p and q to the variables $(x_i)_{i \in J}$, we have $p' \leq_{fo} q'$.

Remark 2.2.21 $\sim_{fo}$ is an equivalence relation on the class of types in the variables $(x_i)_{i \in I}$.

Proposition 2.2.22 *Every completion of *DCFA* eliminates imaginaries.*

Proof :

Let (K, σ, D) be a saturated model of *DCFA*, let $\alpha \in K^{eq}$. Then there is a $\emptyset$ -definable function f and a tuple a in K such that $f(a) = \alpha$.

Let $E = acl^{eq}(\alpha) \cap K$. If α is definable over E , let b be a tuple of E over which α is definable; then $b \in acl^{eq}(\alpha)$. Since we are working in a field, there is a tuple c of K which codes the (finite) set of conjugates of b over α . Hence c and α are interdefinable.

Let us suppose that α is not definable over E , in particular, a is not a tuple of E . We will show that there is a realization b of $tp(a/\alpha)$ such that $b \perp_{Ea}$.

We now work in the theory *DCF*, and replace the tuple a by the infinite tuple $(\sigma^i(a))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, which we also denote by a .

Since $tp(a/\alpha)$ is non-algebraic, it has a realization b such that $acl^{eq}(a) \cap acl^{eq}(b) = acl^{eq}(\alpha)$, and thus

$$acl(Ea) \cap acl(Eb) = E \quad (*)$$

Choose such a b such that, if b' satisfies the same properties, then $tp_{DCF}(b'/acl(Ea)) \not\leq_{fo} tp_{DCF}(b/acl(Ea))$.

Let c be a tuple of K such that $tp(c/acl(Ea)) = tp(b/acl(Ea))$, and $c \perp_{Ea} b$. Then $f(c) = f(a)$ and c satisfies

$$acl(Ec) \cap acl(Eab) \subset acl(Ec) \cap acl(Ea) = E, \quad (**)$$

and there is no c' satisfying $(**)$ such that $tp_{DCF}(c'/acl(Eab)) >_{fo} tp_{DCF}(c/acl(Eab))$. Then $tp(c/acl(Eb)) \geq_{fo} tp(c/acl(Eab)) \sim_{fo} tp(c/acl(Ea))$. Let τ be an $\mathcal{L}_D(E)$ -automorphism sending b to a . Then $tp(\tau(c)/acl(Ea)) \sim_{fo} tp(c/acl(Eb))$, and $\tau(c)$ satisfies $(*)$ (by $(**)$). Hence, by maximality of $tp(b/acl(Ea)) = tp(c/acl(Ea))$, we get that $tp(c/acl(Eb)) \sim_{fo} tp(c/acl(Ea))$, and therefore $c \perp_{Eb} a$. By elimination of imaginaries and $(*)$, this implies that $c \perp_{Eab}$, and therefore $a \perp_E b$.

We have shown that there is a tuple b realizing $tp(a/\alpha)$ independent from a over E . But α is not E -definable, thus there is a' realizing $tp(a/E)$ such that $f(a) \neq f(a')$, and we may choose it independent from b over E . Since $tp(a/E) = tp(a'/E)$, there is a realization c' of $tp(a'/E)$ such that $f(a') = f(c')$ and $c' \perp_E a'$; we may suppose that $c' \perp_E b$. If we apply the independence theorem to $tp(a/Eb) \cup tp(a'/Ec')$ we get a contradiction.

□

Lemma 2.2.23 *Let (K, σ, D) be a model of DCFA, let $E = acl(E) \subset K$, and let (L, τ, D) be a difference-differential field extending (K, σ^n, D) , where n is a positive integer. Then there is a difference-differential field (M, σ', D) containing (E, σ, D) such that $(M, (\sigma')^n, D) \supset (L, \tau, D)$.*

Proof:

For $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ let L_i be a difference-differential field realizing $\sigma^i(tp_{DCF}(L/E))$ such that $L_0 = L, L_1, \dots, L_{n-1}$ are linearly disjoint over E . Let $f_0 = id_L$ and for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ let $f_i : L \rightarrow L_i$ be an $\mathcal{L}_D$ -isomorphism extending σ^i on E .

For $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ let $\sigma_i : L_{i-1} \rightarrow L_i$ be defined by $\sigma_i = f_i f_{i-1}^{-1}$, and let $\sigma_n : L_{n-1} \rightarrow L_0$ be defined by $\sigma_n = \tau f_{n-1}^{-1}$.

Let $x \in E$. If $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ then $\sigma_i(x) = f_i(f_{i-1}^{-1}(x)) = \sigma^i(\sigma^{-(i-1)}(x)) = \sigma(x)$; and $\sigma_n(x) = \tau(\sigma^{-(n-1)}(x)) = \sigma^n(\sigma^{-(n-1)}(x)) = \sigma(x)$. Hence each σ_i extends σ on E .

Also, we have $\sigma_n \sigma_{n-1} \dots \sigma_1 = \tau(f_{n-1}^{-1} f_{n-2}) \dots (f_1 f_0^{-1}) = \tau f_0^{-1} = \tau$.

Let M be the composite of $L_0, \dots, L_{n-1}$. Since the L_i 's are linearly disjoint over E , M is isomorphic to the quotient field of $L_0 \otimes_E \dots \otimes_E L_{n-1}$. There is a unique derivation on M extending the derivations of the L_i 's and there is a unique $\mathcal{L}_D$ -automorphism σ' of M which coincides with σ_i on L_{i-1} for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

By the above $(\sigma')^n$ extends τ .

□

Corollary 2.2.24 *Let (K, σ, D) be a model of DCFA. Then, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (K, σ^n, D) is a model of DCFA.*

Proof:

Let Σ be a finite system of (σ^n, D) -equations over K , and let (L, τ, D) be an extension of (K, σ^n, D) containing a solution of Σ . By 2.2.23 there is an extension (M, σ', D) of (K, σ, D) such that $(M, (\sigma')^n, D)$ is an extension of (L, τ, D) . Thus, M contains a solution of Σ , and since (K, σ, D) is existentially closed, K contains a solution of Σ .

□

2.3 The Field of Constants and the Fixed Field

In this section we study two special subfields of a model (K, σ, D) of *DCFA*: the differential field $(\text{Fix}\sigma, D)$ and the difference field $(\mathcal{C}, \sigma)$ where $\text{Fix}\sigma$ is the fixed field of K and $\mathcal{C}$ is the field of constants of K .

Throughout this section (K, σ, D) will denote a model of *DCFA*.

Proposition 2.3.1 *$(\mathcal{C}, \sigma)$ is a model of ACFA .*

Proof :

Since σ commutes with D , $(\mathcal{C}, \sigma)$ is a difference field.

Now let U, V be varieties defined over $\mathcal{C}$, with $U \subset V \times V^\sigma$ such that U projects generically over V and V^σ . Let $W = U \times (\bar{0}) \subset \tau_1(V \times V^\sigma)$. Then, by 2.2.1 there is $a \in K$ such that $(a, Da, \sigma(a), \sigma(Da)) \in W$. Thus $Da = 0$ and $(a, \sigma(a)) \in U$.
□

Remark 2.3.2 *Clearly the fixed field of $\mathcal{C}$ is $\mathcal{C} \cap \text{Fix}\sigma$, and is pseudofinite by 1.7.20. Hence $\mathcal{C} \cap \text{Fix}\sigma \prec \text{Fix}\sigma$.*

Remark 2.3.3 *$\text{Fix}\sigma$ is a differential field, however it is not differentially closed since it is not algebraically closed as a field. Clearly, it is also a difference field, thus*

$$\text{acl}(\text{Fix}\sigma) = \text{acl}_D(\text{Fix}\sigma) = (\text{Fix}\sigma)^{\text{alg}}.$$

Theorem 2.3.4 *$((\text{Fix}\sigma)^{\text{alg}}, D)$ is a model of DCF .*

Proof :

Let V, W be two irreducible affine varieties defined over $(\text{Fix}\sigma)^{\text{alg}}$ such that $W \subset \tau_1(V)$ and W projects dominantly onto V . Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that both V and W are defined over $\text{Fix}\sigma^k$. Let $U = \{(x, x) : x \in V\}$. Then $U \subset V \times V^{\sigma^k} = V \times V$.

Let $W' = \{(y, y) : y \in W\}$. Then $W' \subset \tau_1(U)$. By 2.2.24 (K, σ^k, D) is a model of *DCFA*; thus, applying 2.2.1 to V, U and W' there is $a \in V(K)$ such that $(a, \sigma^k(a)) \in U$ and $(a, Da, \sigma^k(a), D(\sigma^k(a))) \in W'$. Thus $a = \sigma^k(a)$ and $(a, Da) \in W$. By 1.6.22, $((\text{Fix}\sigma)^{\text{alg}}, D)$ is differentially closed.
□

Using (the proof of) 2.3.4, we can also axiomatize the theory of the structures (F, D) , where F is the fixed field of a model of *DCFA*, as follows:

1. F is a pseudo-finite field.
2. For every irreducible algebraic variety V defined over F , if W is an irreducible algebraic subvariety of $\tau_1(V)$ defined over F , such that the projection of W onto V is dominant, then there is $a \in V(F)$ such that $(a, Da) \in W$.

For such a structure (F, D) we can describe its completions, the types, the algebraic closure in the same way as we did for $DCFA$. For instance, if F_1 and F_2 are two models of this theory and E is a common substructure, $F_1 \equiv_E F_2$ if and only if there is an isomorphism $\varphi : E^{alg} \cap F_1 \rightarrow E^{alg} \cap F_2$ which fixes E . If we add enough constants (for a pseudo finite field F we add a set of constants $A \subset F$ such that $FA^{alg} = F^{alg}$), the generalized independence theorem will hold.

Pseudo-algebraically closed structures were studied by E. Hrushovski in a preprint of 91, to appear in the Ravello Proceedings. In [29] Pillay and Polkowska generalize Hrushovski's results and treat the differential case described above.

We have seen that the field of constants of a model of DCF as well as the fixed field of a model of $ACFA$ are stably embedded (1.6.17 and 1.7.21). The same happens in $DCFA$ for the field $Fix\sigma$ but not for the field $\mathcal{C}$.

Proposition 2.3.5 *$(\mathcal{C}, \sigma)$ is not stably embedded.*

Proof:

Let $a \in Fix\sigma \setminus \mathcal{C}$, then the set $\{x \in K : \exists y \sigma(y) = y \wedge Dx = 0 \wedge y^2 = x + a\}$ is contained in $\mathcal{C}$ but it is not definable with parameters from $\mathcal{C}$.

□

Proposition 2.3.6 *Let A be a definable subset of $(Fix\sigma)^n$. Then A is definable over $Fix\sigma$ in the language $\mathcal{L}_D$.*

Proof:

Since $DCFA$ eliminates imaginaries, there is a canonical parameter a for A . Since A is fixed by σ , a is fixed by σ , thus A is $(Fix\sigma)$ -definable. It is enough to show that there exist a countable subset L of $Fix\sigma$ containing a such that every $\mathcal{L}_D$ -automorphism of $Fix\sigma$ which fixes L extends to an elementary map of some elementary extension of $Fix\sigma$. Let L be a countable elementary $\mathcal{L}_D$ -substructure of $Fix\sigma$ containing a . In particular L is a differential field, and $acl(L) = L^{alg}$.

Since $L \prec_{\mathcal{L}_D} Fix\sigma$, L^{alg} and $Fix\sigma$ are linearly disjoint over L . If L_n is the unique algebraic extension of L of degree n , then $L_n Fix\sigma$ is the unique algebraic extension of $Fix\sigma$ of degree n ; this implies that $(Fix\sigma)^{alg} = L^{alg} Fix\sigma$.

Let τ be a $\mathcal{L}_D$ -automorphism of $Fix\sigma$ over L . Then we can extend τ to a $\mathcal{L}_D$ -automorphism $\bar{\tau}$ of $L^{alg} Fix\sigma$ over L^{alg} . We have that $\bar{\tau}$ commutes with σ . Thus $\bar{\tau}$ is a $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma, D}$ -automorphism of $acl(Fix\sigma)$. Then, by 2.2.12, $\bar{\tau}$ is an elementary map.

□

Remark 2.3.7 *Let (L, L_A) be a pair of fields extending the pair of fields $(Fix\sigma, Fix\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ and which satisfies: L is a regular extension of $Fix\sigma$, L_A is a regular extension of $Fix\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$, and $Fix\sigma$ and L_A are linearly disjoint over $Fix\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$.*

Using the linear disjointness of L_A and $\text{Fix}\sigma$ over $\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$ and 1.6.24, the derivation D of $\text{Fix}\sigma$ extends to a derivation D_1 on L which is 0 on L_A . Defining σ to be the identity on L , the difference differential field (L, D_1, id) embeds (over $\text{Fix}\sigma$) into an elementary extension of $\mathcal{U}$. The following follows easily:

1. The pair $(\text{Fix}\sigma, \text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ is S.P.A.C., that is, if a, b are tuples in some extension of $\text{Fix}\sigma$ such that $\text{Fix}\sigma \subset \text{Fix}\sigma(a, b)$ and $\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C} \subset (\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})(a)$ are regular, and $\text{Fix}\sigma$ is linearly disjoint from $(\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})(a)$ over $\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$; then there is a zero (a', b') of $I(a, b/\text{Fix}\sigma)$ such that $a' \in \text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$.

This notion was introduced by H. Lejeune, see [18].

2. The theory of the structure $\text{Fix}\sigma$ is model complete in the following languages:

- (a) The language of pairs of fields with enough constants to describe all algebraic extensions of $\text{Fix}\sigma$, and with n -ary relation symbols for all n which interpretation in $(\text{Fix}\sigma, \text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ is that the elements $x_1, \dots, x_n$ are $(\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ -linearly independent.
- (b) The language of differential fields with enough constants to describe all algebraic extensions of $\text{Fix}\sigma$ (as in this language extensions are field extensions with an extension of the derivation this will automatically imply linear disjointness).

2.4 Forking and the SU-Rank

Since every completion of $DCFA$ is supersimple, types are ranked by the SU -rank (1.1). This section is devoted to the study of the SU -rank in $DCFA$. Given an element of a model of $DCFA$ we will construct a sequence and we will define a rank for this sequence and we will show that this rank bounds the SU -rank of the element. With this we prove that the SU -rank of a model of $DCFA$ is ω^2 .

Remark 2.4.1 Let $E = \text{acl}(E)$, and let us suppose that $\deg_{\sigma, D}(a/E) < \infty$. Let $F = \text{acl}(F) \supset E$. Then $a \perp_E F$ if and only if $\deg_{\sigma, D}(a/F) < \deg_{\sigma, D}(a/E)$. Thus, by induction on $\deg_{\sigma, D}(a/E)$ we can prove that $SU(a/E) \leq \deg_{\sigma, D}(a/E)$.

In order to compute the SU -rank of a completion of $DCFA$, to any type we will associate a sequence in $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and we will define a rank for such a sequence; in some cases this rank will bound the SU -rank of the type. Let $(I, \leq)$ be the class of decreasing sequences of $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ indexed by $\mathbb{N}$, partially ordered as follows: If $(m_n), (m'_n) \in I$, then $(m_n) \leq (m'_n)$ if and only if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $m_n \leq m'_n$. We write $(m_n) < (m'_n)$ if $(m_n) \leq (m'_n)$ and $(m_n) \neq (m'_n)$.

Remark 2.4.2 If $(m_n) \in I$, then there exist $A \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $B, C \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m_n = \infty$ if and only if $n < A$, and $m_n = C$ if and only if $n \geq A + B$.

Definition 2.4.3 Let $(m_n) \in I$. We define the Foundation Rank of (m_n) , denoted $FR(m_n)$ as follows. Let α be an ordinal:

1. $FR(m_n) \geq 0$.
2. $FR(m_n) \geq \alpha + 1$ if there is $(m'_n) \in I$ such that $(m_n) > (m'_n)$ and $FR(m'_n) \geq \alpha$.
3. If α is a limit ordinal, then $FR(m_n) \geq \alpha$ if $FR(m_n) \geq \beta$ for every $\beta < \alpha$.
4. $FR(m_n)$ is the smallest ordinal α such that $FR(m_n) \geq \alpha$ but $FR(m_n) \not\geq \alpha + 1$.

Definition 2.4.4 Let (K, σ, D) be a model of DCFA, $E = \text{acl}(E) \subset K$, and $a \in K$. To a and E we associate the sequence (a_n^E) defined by:

$$a_n^E = \text{tr.dg}(E(a, Da, \dots, D^n a)_\sigma / E(a, Da, \dots, D^{n-1} a)_\sigma).$$

Remark 2.4.5

1. By 1.6.29, $(a_n^E) \in I$.
2. Assume that either a is a single element, or that a is σ -algebraic over E . If $E \subset F = \text{acl}(F)$, then $\text{tp}(a/E)$ does not fork over F if and only if $a \perp_E F$, if and only if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{tr.dg}(E(a, Da, \dots, D^n a)_\sigma / E(a, Da, \dots, D^{n-1} a)_\sigma) = \text{tr.dg}(F(a, Da, \dots, D^n a)_\sigma / F(a, Da, \dots, D^{n-1} a)_\sigma)$, if and only if $(a_n^E) = (a_n^F)$. Hence $SU(a/E) \leq FR(a_n^E)$.

Proposition 2.4.6 Let $(m_n) \in I$, let A, B, C as in 2.4.2. If $A \neq \infty$ then $FR(m_n) = \omega \cdot (A + C) + \sum_{j=A}^{A+B-1} (m_j - C)$; if $A = \infty$ then $FR(m_n) = \omega^2$.

Proof:

First we observe that if $B' > B$, then $\sum_{j=A}^{A+B'-1} (m_j - C) = \sum_{j=A}^{A+B-1} (m_j - C)$. We proceed by induction on the ordinal $\alpha = \omega \cdot (A + C) + \sum_{j=A}^{A+B-1} (m_j - C)$. For $\alpha = 0$ it is clear. Suppose that the theorem holds for α .

Let $(m_n) \in I$, and A, B, C as in 2.4.2, such that $\alpha + 1 = \omega \cdot (A + C) + \sum_{j=A}^{A+B-1} (m_j - C)$; this implies in particular that $B \neq 0$ and $m_{A+B-1} > C$.

$FR(m_n) > \alpha$:

Let $(m'_n) \in I$ such that $m'_n = m_n$ for $n \neq A + B - 1$ and $m'_{A+B-1} = m_{A+B-1} - 1$, so that $(m'_n) \in I$ and $(m'_n) < (m_n)$. Let A', B', C' be the numbers associated to (m'_n) by 2.4.2. Then $A' = A$, $C' = C$, $B' \leq B$ and $\omega \cdot (A' + C') + \sum_{j=A'}^{A'+B'-1} (m'_j - C') = \alpha$. By induction hypothesis $FR(m'_n) = \alpha < FR(m_n)$.

$FR(m_n) = \alpha + 1$:

Let $(m'_n) \in I$ such that $(m'_n) < (m_n)$. Let A', B', C' be the numbers associated to (m'_n) by 2.4.2. Then $A' \leq A$ and $C' \leq C$. We want to show that $FR(m'_n) \leq \alpha$.

If $A' < A$ or $C' < C$ we have $A' + C' < A + C$, and thus $\omega \cdot (A' + C') < \omega \cdot (A + C)$. Since $\sum_{j=A'}^{A'+B'-1} (m'_j - C') \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha + 1 = \omega \cdot (A + C) + \sum_{j=A}^{A+B-1} (m_j - C) > \omega \cdot (A' + C') + \sum_{j=A'}^{A'+B'-1} (m'_j - C')$ and by induction hypothesis the latter equals $FR(m'_n)$.

If $A' = A$ and $C' = C$, then there is $k \in \{A, \dots, A + B - 1\}$ such that $m'_k < m_k$. In this case we have $\sum_{j=A}^{A+B-1} (m'_j - C) < \sum_{j=A}^{A+B-1} (m_j - C)$, hence $\alpha + 1 = \omega \cdot (A + C) + \sum_{j=A}^{A+B-1} (m_j - C) > \omega \cdot (A + C) + \sum_{j=A}^{A+B-1} (m'_j - C)$. This shows the result in the case $\alpha + 1$.

Assume now that α is a limit ordinal $< \omega^2$, and let $(m_n) \in I$ (with the associated numbers $A, B = 0, C$) such that $\alpha = \omega \cdot (A + C)$ with $A + C \neq 0$ ($B = 0$).

We shall prove that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $(m'_n) \in I$ such that $(m'_n) < (m_n)$ and $FR(m'_n) = \omega \cdot (A + C - 1) + k$.

If $A \neq 0$, let $(m'_n) \in I$ be such that $m'_{A-1} = C + k$, $m'_n = \infty$ for $n < A - 1$ and $m'_n = C$ for $n > A - 1$. We have $(m'_n) < (m_n)$ and by induction hypothesis $FR(m'_n) = \omega \cdot (A + C - 1) + k$. If $A = 0$, then $C \neq 0$. Let $(m'_n) \in I$ such that $m'_n = C - 1$ for $n \geq k$ and $m'_n = C$ if $n < k$. Then $(m'_n) < (m_n)$ and by induction hypothesis $FR(m'_n) = \omega \cdot (C - 1) + k$. Thus $FR(m_n) \geq \alpha$.

$FR(m_n) = \alpha$:

Let $(m'_n) \in I$ such that $(m'_n) < (m_n)$, let A', B', C' be the numbers associated to (m'_n) by 2.4.2. Then $A' < A$ or $C' < C$, hence $A' + C' < A + C$, and $\omega \cdot (A' + C') + \sum_{j=A'}^{A'+B'-1} (m'_j - C') < \omega \cdot (A + C) = \alpha$. By induction hypothesis $FR(m'_n) < \alpha$. This shows that $FR(m_n) \not\geq \alpha + 1$, i.e. $FR(m_n) = \alpha$.

$\alpha = \omega^2$: Let (m_n) be the sequence defined by $m_n = \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By induction hypothesis we know that if $(m'_n) < (m_n)$ is in I , then $FR(m'_n) < \omega^2$. Hence $FR(m_n) \not\geq \omega^2 + 1$. On the other hand, for every $k \in \omega$, let (m_n^k) be the sequence with associated numbers $A = k, B = C = 0$. Then $FR(m_n) > FR(m_n^k) = \omega k$.

□

Proposition 2.4.7 *Let (K, σ, D) be a model of DCFA and let $a \in K$ be (σ, D) -transcendental over $F = \text{acl}(F) \subset K$. Let $(m_n) \in I$. Then there is a difference-differential field $E \subset K$ such that $(a_n^E) = (m_n)$.*

Proof :

Define $b_0 = a, b_1 = \sigma(a) - a, \dots, b_{k+1} = \sigma(b_k) - b_k, \dots$ and $b_\infty = 1$. Let $E = F(D^i b_{m_i} : i \in \mathbb{N})_\sigma$. For all i , $D^{i+1} b_{m_i} \in F(D^{i+1} b_{m_{i+1}})_\sigma$, hence E is a difference-differential field and by construction and because a is (σ, D) -transcendental over F ,

$$\text{tr.dg}(E(a, \dots, D^{n+1}a)_\sigma / E(a, \dots, D^n a)_\sigma) =$$

$$= \text{tr.dg}(F(a, \dots, D^{n+1}a)_\sigma / F(a, \dots, D^n a, D^{n+1}b_{m_{n+1}})_\sigma)$$

and as a is (σ, D) -transcendental over F , the latter equals m_{n+1} .

□

Corollary 2.4.8 *Let a be a tuple of K such that, the elements of $\{\sigma^i(D^j a) : i, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are algebraically independent over E . Let n be the transcendence degree of a over E . Then $SU(a/E) = \omega^2 \cdot n$.*

2.5 Remarks on Stability, Stable Embeddability and 1-basedness

We know that no completion of $DCFA$ is stable. As in the case of completions of $ACFA$, it turns out that certain definable sets, endowed with the structure induced by the ambient model, are stable stably embedded. In this section we discuss how to apply results from [2] to obtain similar results in models of $DCFA$. We also give a criterion for 1-basedness in $DCFA$.

Definition 2.5.1 *A (partial) type p over a set A is stable stably embedded if whenever a realises p and $B \supset A$, then $tp(a/B)$ is definable. Equivalently, let P denote the set of realizations of p . Then p is stable stably embedded if and only if for all set $S \cap P^n$ where S is definable, there is a set S' definable with parameters from P and such that $S' \cap P^n = S \cap P^n$.*

[Note: if p is complete, this is what Shelah calls a stable type].

The following result is proved in the Appendix of [2]:

Lemma 2.5.2 *If $tp(b/A)$ and $tp(a/Ab)$ are stable stably embedded, so is $tp(a, b/A)$.*

In [2], a certain property (called superficial stability) is isolated, and guarantees that certain types over algebraically closed sets are stationary, and therefore definable. It follows from model theoretic considerations that if for any algebraically closed set B containing A , $tp(a/B)$ is stationary, then $tp(a/A)$ will be stable and stably embedded.

Lemma 2.5.3 *Let (K, σ) be a model of $ACFA$, $A = acl_\sigma(A) \subset K$ and $a \in K$. Then $tp(a/A)$ is stationary if and only if $tp(a/A) \perp (\sigma(x) = x)$.*

Proof:

Indeed, write $SU(a/A) = \omega k + n$, and let $b \in acl_\sigma(Aa)$ be such that $SU(b/A) = n$. Then $tp(b/A) \perp (\sigma(x) = x)$, and by Theorem 4.11 of [2], $tp(acl_\sigma(Ab)/A)$ is stationary. If $c \in acl_\sigma(Aa)$ satisfies some non-trivial difference equation over $acl_\sigma(Ab)$ then $SU(c/Ab) < \omega$ and therefore $c \in acl_\sigma(Ab)$. Hence, by Theorem 5.3 of [3], $tp(a/acl_\sigma(Ab))$ is stationary, and therefore so is $tp(a/A)$.

For the converse, there are independent realizations $a_1, \dots, a_n$ of $tp(a/A)$, and elements $b_1, \dots, b_m \in Fix\sigma$ such that $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $(b_1, \dots, b_m)$ are not independent over A . Looking at the field of definition of the algebraic locus of $(b_1, \dots, b_m)$ over $acl_\sigma(A, a_1, \dots, a_n)$, there is some $b \in Fix\sigma \cap acl_\sigma(A, a_1, \dots, a_n)$, $b \notin A$. Then $tp(b/A)$ is not stationary: if

$c \in \text{Fix}\sigma$ is independent from b over A , then $tp(b/A)$ has two distinct non-forking extensions to Ac , one in which $\sqrt{b+c} \in \text{Fix}\sigma$, the other in which $\sqrt{b+c} \notin \text{Fix}\sigma$. Hence $tp(a_1, \dots, a_n/A)$ is not stationary, and neither is $tp(a/A)$.

□

It is important to note that stationarity alone does not imply stability: if a is transformally transcendental over $A = \text{acl}_\sigma(A)$, then $tp_{ACFA}(a/A)$ is stationary, but it is not stable. These results can be used to give sufficient conditions on types in $DCFA$ to be stationary, and stable stably embedded.

Proposition 2.5.4 *Let (K, σ, D) be a model of $DCFA$, let $A = \text{acl}(A) \subset K$, and a a tuple in K .*

1. *Assume that $tp_{ACFA}(a, Da, D^2a, \dots / A) \perp \sigma(x) = x$. Then $tp(a/A)$ is stationary.*
2. *Assume that for every n , $tp_{ACFA}(D^n a / Aa \dots D^{n-1}a)$ is hereditarily orthogonal to $(\sigma(x) = x)$. Then $tp(a/A)$ is stable stably embedded. It is also 1-based.*
3. *If $tp(a/A)$ is not hereditarily orthogonal to $(\sigma(x) = x)$, then $tp(a/A)$ is not stable stably embedded.*

Proof:

1. As $tp_{ACFA}(a, Da, D^2a, \dots / A) \perp \sigma(x) = x$, 2.5.3 implies that $tp_{ACFA}(a, Da, D^2a, \dots / A)$ is stationary. Let b, c be two realizations of non-forking extensions of $tp(a/A)$ to a set $B = \text{acl}(B) \supset A$. As $tp_{ACFA}(a, Da, D^2a, \dots / A)$ is stationary we have that $tp_{ACFA}(b, Db, D^2b, \dots / B) = tp_{ACFA}(c, Dc, D^2c, \dots / B)$. If $\varphi(x)$ is an $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma, D}(B)$ -formula satisfied by b , then there is a $\mathcal{L}_\sigma(B)$ -formula $\psi(x_0, \dots, x_k)$ such that $\phi(b) = \psi(b, Db, \dots, D^k b)$; so we have $\psi(b, Db, \dots, D^k b) \in tp_{ACFA}(b, Db, D^2b, \dots / B) = tp_{ACFA}(c, Dc, D^2c, \dots / B)$. This implies that $tp(b/B) = tp(c/B)$, and thus $tp(a/A)$ is stationary.
2. By 2.5.3 for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $B \supset A$, $tp_{ACFA}(D^n a / Ba \dots D^{n-1}a)$ is stationary. Thus for all n , $tp_{ACFA}(D^n a / Aa \dots D^{n-1}a)$ is stable stably embedded and 1-based. By 2.5.2 stable stable embeddability is preserved by extensions, hence $tp_{ACFA}(a, Da, \dots / A)$ is stable stably embedded, and this implies that all extensions to algebraically closed sets are stationary. As above, we deduce that all extensions of $tp(a/A)$ to algebraically closed sets are stationary, hence $tp(a/A)$ is stable stably embedded. By 1.2.4 we have also that $tp_{ACFA}(a, Da, \dots / A)$ est 1-based. By the definition of independence in difference-differential fields and the fact that $\text{acl}(A, a) = \text{acl}_{DCF}(A, a, Da, \dots)$ $tp(a/A)$ is 1-based: Let $A \subset B = \text{acl}(B) \subset C = \text{acl}(C)$, and let b be tuple of realisations of $tp(a/A)$. By hypothesis $tp_{ACFA}(a, Da, \dots / A)$ is 1-based, therefore $(b, Db, \dots)$ is independent from C over B in $ACFA$. Hence, $(b, Db, \dots, D^n b)$ is $ACFA$ -independent from C over B , for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for every finite subset S of $\text{acl}(Bb)$, $B(S)$ is linearly disjoint from C over B (that is because every such S is such that $B(S)$ contained in $\text{acl}_\sigma(B, b, Db, \dots, D^n b)$ for some n). Thus by definition of linear disjointness $\text{acl}(Bb)$ is linearly disjoint from C over B . So b is $DCFA$ -independent from C over B .
3. If $tp(a/K)$ is not hereditarily orthogonal to $\sigma(x) = x$ then there is $B = \text{acl}(B) \supset A$ such that $tp(a/B) \not\perp \sigma(x) = x$. Then there are independent realizations $a_1, \dots, a_n$ of

$tp(a/B)$, and elements $b_1, \dots, b_m \in \text{Fix}\sigma$ such that $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $(b_1, \dots, b_m)$ are not independent over B .

If we look at the field of definition of the algebraic locus of $(b_1, \dots, b_m)$ over $\text{acl}(A, a_1, \dots, a_n)$, we can find $b \in \text{Fix}\sigma \cap \text{acl}(A, a_1, \dots, a_n)$, $b \notin A$. Then $tp(b/A)$ is not stationary: Let $c \in \text{Fix}\sigma$ be independent from b over A , then $tp(b/A)$ has two distinct non-forking extensions to Ac , one in which $\sqrt{b+c} \in \text{Fix}\sigma$, the other in which $\sqrt{b+c} \notin \text{Fix}\sigma$. Hence $tp(a_1, \dots, a_n/A)$ is not stationary, and neither is $tp(a/A)$.

□

Remark 2.5.5 *Let A, K and a be as above.*

1. *If $SU(a/A) = 1$, then the stationarity of $tp(a/A)$ implies its stability and stable embeddability.*
2. *There are examples of types of SU -rank 1 which satisfy (1) above but do not satisfy (2). Thus condition (2) is not implied by stationarity.*

Corollary 2.5.6 *Let $A = \text{acl}(A)$, and a a tuple in $\mathcal{C}$. Then $tp(a/A)$ is stable stably embedded if and only if $tp_{ACFA}(a/A)$ is stable stably embedded. In this case, it will also be 1-based.*

Proposition 2.5.7 *Let $A = \text{acl}(A) \subset K$, and a a tuple in K , with $SU(a/A) = 1$. If $tp_{ACFA}(a/A) \perp (\sigma(x) = x)$ then $tp(a/A)$ is stable stably embedded. In particular, if $tp_{ACFA}(a/A)$ is stable stably embedded, then so is $tp(a/A)$.*

Proof:

Suppose that $tp(a/A)$ is not stable stably embedded; then there is $B = \text{acl}(B) \supset A$ such that $tp(a/B)$ is not stationary, and therefore $tp_{ACFA}(a, Da, D^2a, \dots / B)$ is not stationary. By 2.5.4 $tp_{ACFA}(a, Da, D^2a, \dots / A) \not\perp (\sigma(x) = x)$. Hence, there is some algebraically closed difference field L containing A , which is linearly disjoint from $\text{acl}(Aa)$ over A , and an element $b \in \text{Fix}\sigma \cap (L\text{acl}(Aa))^{\text{alg}}$, $b \notin L$. Looking at the coefficients of the minimal polynomial of b over $L\text{acl}(Aa)$, we may assume that $b \in L\text{acl}(Aa)$. Let $M = \text{acl}(L)$, and chose (M', L') realising $tp(M, L/A)$ and independent from a over A . Then $qftp_{ACFA}(L'/Aa) = qftp_{ACFA}(L/Aa)$ and there is $b' \in L'\text{acl}(Aa)$ such that $\sigma(b') = b'$. Since $SU(a/L') = 1$, we get $a \in \text{acl}(L'b') = L(b')_D^{\text{alg}}$. This implies that $tp_{ACFA}(a/L') \not\perp (\sigma(x) = x)$, and gives us a contradiction.

□

Remark 2.5.8 *As stated, the result of 2.5.7 is false if one only assumes $SU(a/A) < \omega$. The correct formulation in that case is as follows:*

Assume $SU(a/A) < \omega$ and that $\text{acl}_\sigma(Aa)$ contains a sequence $a_1, \dots, a_n$ of tuples such that, for all $i \leq n$, working in $DCFA$, $SU(a_i/Aa_1, \dots, a_{i-1}) = 1$. Under these hypotheses, if $tp_{ACFA}(a/A)$ is stable stably embedded then so is $tp(a/A)$.

Lemma 2.5.9 *Let a be a tuple of a model of $DCFA$, and A a subset of that model. If $tp_{DCF}(a/A)$ is 1-based then $tp(a/A)$ is 1-based.*

Proof:

Analogue to the last statement in the proof of 2.5.4.2

□

2.6 An Example

In this section we exhibit a set of SU -rank 1 which is infinite-dimensional. It is known that in DCF and $ACFA$, being finite-dimensional and having finite rank are equivalent and this is an important equivalence which had led, for example, to algebraic proofs of the dichotomies for those theories (see [30]).

Example 2.6.1 $\sigma(x) = x^2 + 1$.

Let A be the set defined by $\sigma(x) = x^2 + 1$. Let $A_1 = \{x \in A : Dx = 0\}$ and let $A_2 = \{x \in A : Dx \neq 0\}$. Then A_1 and A_2 are stably embedded and strongly minimal.

Proof:

Let $K = acl(K)$ and let $a \in A_2$, $a \notin K$. Let $K_0 = K(a)_\sigma$ and $K_{n+1} = K_n(D^{n+1}a)$. Since $\sigma(D^n a) = \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i} D^i a D^{n-i} a$ for $n > 0$, each K_n is a difference field.

Let us write the equation satisfied by $\sigma(D^n a)$ over K_n as $\sigma(D^n a) = f_n(D^n a)$. Set $f_n^1(X) = f_n(X)$ and $f_n^{k+1}(X) = (f_n^k)^\sigma(f_n(X))$. Then $\sigma^k(D^n a) = f_n^k(D^n a)$ and we have $f_n(X) = 2aX + b_n$ where $b_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{i} D^i a D^{n-i} a$ when $n > 0$. Note that $f_0^{k+1}(0) = f_0^k(0)^2 + 1$, so that $f_0^k(0) \neq 0$ for all $k \geq 0$, and the numbers $f_0^k(0)$ form a strictly increasing sequence.

Given a difference field E , a finite σ -stable extension of E is a finite field extension F of E such that $\sigma(F) \subset F$.

We shall prove the following for $n \geq 1$:

I_n: K_{n-1} contains no finite subset S such that $\sigma(S) = f_n(S)$, unless $n = 1$ in which case $S = \{0\}$.

II_n: $K_{n-1}^{alg}(D^n a)$ has no proper finite σ -stable extensions.

III_n: Any solution of $\sigma(x) = x$ in K_n is in K . This implies that the solutions of $\sigma(x) = (2a)^m x$ in K_n are of the form $c(Da)^m$ where $c \in Fix\sigma \cap K$; and the solutions of $\sigma^k(x) = 2^k a \sigma(a) \cdots \sigma^{k-1}(a)x$ are of the form cDa where $c \in Fix\sigma^k \cap K$.

It will be useful to consider some variants of the first two statements:

$\mathbf{I}'_n$: K_{n-1} contains no finite subset S such that $\sigma^k(S) = f_n^k(S)$, unless $n = 1$ in which case $S = \{0\}$.

$\mathbf{I}''_n$: K_{n-1}^{alg} contains no finite subset S such that $\sigma^k(S) = f_n^k(S)$, unless $n = 1$ in which case $S = \{0\}$.

$\mathbf{II}'_n$: K_n has no proper σ -stable finite extensions.

We will first show some implications between these statements. We suppose $n \geq 1$.

$\mathbf{I}_n \implies \mathbf{I}'_n$: Replace S by $S \cup \sigma^{-1}f_n(S) \cup \dots \cup (\sigma^{-1}f_n)^{k-1}(S)$.

$\mathbf{I}'_n \wedge \mathbf{II}'_{n-1} \implies \mathbf{I}''_n$: By 6.1 of [2] we know that K_0 has no proper finite σ -stable extension so that $\mathbf{II}'_0$ holds. Let $S \subset K_{n-1}^{alg}$ be finite and such that $\sigma^k(S) = f_n^k(S)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $K_{n-1}(S)_\sigma = K_{n-1}(S \cup \sigma(S) \cup \dots \cup \sigma^{k-1}(S))$. By $\mathbf{II}'_{n-1}$ $S \subset K_{n-1}$ and this implies $n = 1$, $S = \{0\}$.

$\mathbf{I}''_n \implies \mathbf{II}_n$: Suppose that L is a finite σ -stable extension of $K_{n-1}^{alg}(D^n a)$ (by $\mathbf{I}''_n$, $D^n a$ is transcendental over K_{n-1}). Then the ramification locus of L over K_n gives us a finite set $S \subset K_{n-1}^{alg}$ such that $\sigma(S) = f_n(S)$ (see the proof of 4.8 in [2]), and this contradicts $\mathbf{I}''_n$.

$\mathbf{II}_n \wedge \mathbf{II}'_{n-1} \implies \mathbf{II}'_n$: As before, we know that $\mathbf{II}'_0$ holds. Let L be a finite σ -stable extension of $K_n = K_{n-1}(D^n a)$. By $\mathbf{II}'_{n-1}$, $L \cap K_{n-1}^{alg} = K_{n-1}$. Hence $[LK_{n-1}^{alg} : K_{n-1}^{alg}K_n] = [L : K_n] = 1$ by $\mathbf{II}_n$.

$\mathbf{I}''_n \implies \mathbf{III}_n$: Suppose there is such a solution $b \in K_n$. Applying σ to b we get $f(X), g(X) \in K_{n-1}[X]$ relatively prime with $g(X)$ monic, such that

$$\frac{f^\sigma(f_n(D^n a))}{g^\sigma(f_n(D^n a))} = \frac{f(D^n a)}{g(D^n a)}.$$

Note that, as $f(X)$ and $g(X)$ are relatively prime, $f^\sigma(f_n(X))$, and $g^\sigma(f_n(X))$ are relatively prime: otherwise, they would have a common root α in K , this implies that $f(\beta) = g(\beta) = 0$ for $\beta = \sigma^{-1}f_n(\alpha)$.

We know that the left side and the right side of the equation should have the same poles, say, $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in K_{n-1}^{alg}$. Then $g(X) = \prod_{i=1}^m (X - \alpha_i)$ and $g^\sigma(f_n(X)) = \prod_{i=1}^m (f_n(X) - \sigma(\alpha_i))$ and they have to have the same degree since f_n is linear; thus $f_n(\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\}) = \sigma(\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\})$ which contradicts $\mathbf{I}''_n$ unless $n = 1$ and $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\} = \{0\}$. The same argument applies to f , then $b \in K_1$ and we have $\frac{f(X)}{g(X)} = \alpha X^l$ with $\alpha \in K_0$ and $l \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Inverting b , we may assume that $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Then α satisfies $\sigma(X) = (2a)^l X$. Choose $N \geq 0$ minimal such that $\sigma^N(\alpha) \in K(a)$. Then $\sigma^N(\alpha)$ satisfies $\sigma(X) = (2\sigma^N(a))^l X$. If $N > 0$, this implies that $\sigma^N(\alpha) \in K(\sigma(a))$ and contradicts the minimality of N . Hence $l = 0$. Let

$P, Q \in K[X]$ be relatively prime with Q monic and such that $\alpha = \frac{P(a)}{Q(a)}$. Then

$$\frac{P^\sigma(X^2 + 1)}{Q^\sigma(X^2 + 1)} = (2X)^l \frac{P(X)}{Q(X)}.$$

Comparing the number of poles and zeroes, we get $\deg(Q) = 0$ and $\deg(P) = l$. Hence, if $l = 0$, then $\alpha \in K$, and we are done. If $l > 0$, then $P^\sigma(f_0(0)) = 0 = P^\sigma(1)$, hence $P(1) = 0$; by induction, one then shows that for all $k > 0$, $f_0^k(0)$ is a zero of P . Since the sequence $f_0^k(0)$ is strictly increasing, this is impossible. Hence $l = 0$.

Proof of $\mathbf{I}_1$:

$K_0 = K(a)_\sigma$ and $f_1(X) = 2aX$. Suppose that there is a finite subset $S \subset K_0 \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\sigma(S) = f_1(S)$.

$(\sigma^{-1}f_1)$ defines a permutation on S , so $(\sigma^{-1}f_1)^k = id$ for some $k > 0$ (if $|S| = 1$, $k = 1$) and this implies that K_0 contains a solution b of $\sigma^k(x) = 2^k a \sigma(a) \cdots \sigma^{k-1}(a)x$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be minimal such that $\sigma^N(b) \in K(a)$. Write $\sigma^N(b) = \frac{f(a)}{g(a)}$ with $f(X), g(X) \in K[X]$ relatively prime and $g(X)$ monic. Then the equation is

$$\frac{f^{\sigma^k}(f_0^k(X))}{g^{\sigma^k}(f_0^k(X))} = 2^k f_0^N(X) \cdots f_0^{N+k-1}(X) \frac{f(X)}{g(X)}.$$

By minimality of N , $\frac{f(a)}{g(a)} \notin K(\sigma(a))$, but this is impossible if $N \geq 1$. Thus $N = 0$ and the equation is

$$\frac{f^{\sigma^k}(f_0^k(X))}{g^{\sigma^k}(f_0^k(X))} = 2^k X f_0(X) \cdots f_0^{k-1}(X) \frac{f(X)}{g(X)}.$$

As the righthand side and lefthand side of this equation should have the same poles, $f^{\sigma^k}(f_0^k(X))$ and $g^{\sigma^k}(f_0^k(X))$ are relatively prime, and g is monic we have $g(X) = 1$.

Then $f^{\sigma^k}(f_0^k(X)) = 2^k X f_0(X) \cdots f_0^{k-1}(X) f(X)$. So $2^k \deg(f) = \deg f + 2^k - 1$, which implies $\deg(f) = 1$. Then $f(X) = cX + d$ with $c, d \in K$. Substituting in the equation we have $\sigma^k(c)f_0^k(X) + \sigma^k(d) = 2^k X^2 f_0(X) \cdots f_0^{k-1}(X)c + 2^k X f_0(X) \cdots f_0^{k-1}(X)d$. Since the lefthand side has only even degrees and the degree of $X f_0(X) \cdots f_0^{k-1}(X)$ is odd we have $d = 0$. Finally, as $f_0^k(0) \neq 0$, the righthand side has no constant term, we obtain $c = 0$.

Now we assume that $\mathbf{I}_k$ holds for all $1 \leq k < n$, where $n \geq 2$. By what we have shown before the following statements hold:

$\mathbf{I}'_k$ for $1 \leq k < n$.

$\mathbf{II}_k$ for $1 \leq k < n$.

$\mathbf{II}'_k$ for $0 \leq k < n$.

$\mathbf{I}''_k$ for $1 \leq k < n$.

$\mathbf{III}_k$ for $1 \leq k < n$.

Proof of $\mathbf{I}_n$:

Assume that there is a finite set $S \subset K_{n-1}$ such that $\sigma(S) = f_n(S)$.

When $|S| > 1$ we will show that the difference of two distinct elements of S is of the form cDa with $c \in \text{Fix}\sigma \cap K$. Indeed, let a_1, a_2 be two distinct elements of S . Reasoning as in the proof of **I**₁, there is $k > 0$ such that $\sigma^k(a_i) = f_n^k(a_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then $b = a_1 - a_2$ satisfies the equation $\sigma^k(X) = 2^k a \sigma(a) \cdots \sigma^{k-1}(a)X$, and by **III**_n $b = cDa$ with $c \in \text{Fix}\sigma^k \cap K$.

Let $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ be a cycle in S (i.e. $\sigma(a_i) = f_n(a_{i+1})$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $\sigma(a_m) = f_n(a_1)$). Then $\sigma(a_1 + \dots + a_m) = 2a(a_1 + \dots + a_m) + mb_n$, hence

$$\sigma(a_1 + \dots + a_m) = \sigma(ma_1 + (a_2 - a_1) + \dots + (a_m - a_1)) = \sigma(ma_1 + d_1Da)$$

for some $d_1 \in \text{Fix}\sigma^k \cap K$. Hence $\sigma(a_1) = 2aa_1 + b_n + c$ where $c = dDa$ for some $d \in K$. If $|S| = 1$ then $\sigma(a_1) = 2aa_1 + b_n$, and we set $c = 0$.

We will show that this equation has no solutions in K_{n-1} .

Case $n \neq 2$: We can write $b_n = 2nDaD^{n-1}a + c_1$ where $c_1 \in K_{n-2}$. We need to show that there is no $f(X) \in K_{n-2}(X)$ such that $f^\sigma(2aX + b_{n-1}) = 2af(X) + 2nDaX + c'$ where $c' = c + c_1 \in K_{n-2}$. If we take the derivative of this equation with respect to X we get $2a(f')^\sigma(2aX + b_{n-1}) = 2af'(X) + 2nDa$, i.e. $D^{n-1}a$ satisfies the equation

$$(f')^\sigma(2aX + b_{n-1}) = f'(X) + \frac{nDa}{a}. \quad (1)$$

We also have $2a(f'')^\sigma(2aX + b_{n-1}) = f''(X)$, and by **III**_{n-1}, $f''(D^{n-1}a) = e(Da)^{-1}$ for some $e \in \text{Fix}\sigma \cap K$. Thus $f''(X)$ is constant, so $f'(X)$ is a polynomial of degree at most 1 in X and its leading coefficient is $e(Da)^{-1}$. Now we look at the degrees in a of the equation (1): $\deg_a b_{n-1} = 0$, and as $\deg_a(e(Da)^{-1}) = 0$, $\deg_a(f'(X)) = \deg_a(f'(0)) = u$. If $u \leq 0$ we have $\deg_a((f')^\sigma(2aX + b_{n-1})) = 1$ and if $u > 0$ we have $\deg_a((f')^\sigma(2aX + b_{n-1})) = \deg(f'(0)) = 2u$.

In both cases, if we compute the degrees in (1) we get a contradiction.

Case $n = 2$: Then $b_2 = 2(Da)^2$, and the equation satisfied by a_1 is $\sigma(a_1) = 2aa_1 + 2(Da)^2 + dDa$ with $d = 0$ if $|S| = 1$. We will show this equation has no solutions in K_1 . If it has there is $f(X) \in K_0(X)$ such that $f^\sigma(2aX) = 2af(X) + 2X^2 + dX$. Taking the second derivative we get $4a^2(f'')^\sigma(2aX) = 2af''(X) + 4$, i.e.

$$(f'')^\sigma(2aX) = \frac{f''(X)}{2a} + \frac{1}{a^2}. \quad (2)$$

Taking the third derivative we obtain $4a^2(f''')^\sigma(2aX) = f'''(X)$; by **III**₁ $f'''(Da) = e(Da)^{-2}$, which implies $f'''(X) = eX^{-2}$ and therefore $e = 0$. Thus $f''(X) = b \in K_0$. Let M be the smallest natural number such that $\sigma^M(b) \in K(a)$. Write $\sigma^M(b) = \frac{P(a)}{Q(a)}$ where P and Q are relatively prime polynomials over K . Then

$$\frac{\sigma(P(a))}{\sigma(Q(a))} = \frac{P(a)}{2Q(a)\sigma^M(a)} + \frac{1}{(\sigma^M(a))^2}.$$

If $M \geq 1$, by minimality of M , $\frac{P(a)}{Q(a)} \notin K(\sigma(a))$, but this is absurd. Hence $M = 0$. So the equation is

$$\frac{\sigma(P(a))}{\sigma(Q(a))} = \frac{P(a)}{2Q(a)a} + \frac{1}{a^2}.$$

Then the zeroes of $Q^\sigma(X^2 + 1)$ are contained in the zeroes of $X^2Q(X)$ and comparing the degrees we have that $\deg Q < 3$. If $Q(0) = 0$, then $Q^\sigma(1) = 1$, hence $Q(1) = 0$ and $Q^\sigma(2) = 0$, thus $Q(2) = 0$ which is a contradiction. If $Q(0) \neq 0$ then the zeroes of $Q^\sigma(X^2 + 1)$ are contained in the zeroes of $Q(X)$ which implies $\deg(Q) = 0$. Hence $Q = 1$. The equation is reduced to

$$P^\sigma(a^2 + 1) = \frac{P(a)}{2a} + \frac{1}{a^2}$$

and comparing the degrees we get a contradiction.

Hence (2) has no solutions in K_1 . This finishes the proof of $\mathbf{I}_n$.

□

Let $a \in A$ and $a \notin K$.

If $a \in A_1$ then by 6.1 of [2] $K(a)_{\sigma,D} = K(a)_\sigma$ has no finite σ -stable extension. Then all extensions of σ over $\text{acl}(Ka)$ are conjugates over $K(a)_{\sigma,D}$ (see [2]), thus $qftp(a/K) \vdash tp(a/K)$ and this holds for an arbitrary difference-differential field K . This means that $tp(a/K)$ is the only non-realized type of A_1 , and A_1 is strongly minimal. By 6.1 of [2], we know that A_1 is trivial.

If $a \in A_2$, by $\mathbf{I}_{n+1}''$, $D^{n+1}a \notin K_n^{\text{alg}}$, $\text{tr.deg}(K_{n+1}/K_n) = 1$, and this implies that a is differentially transcendental over K . Then $tp(a/K)$ is the only non-realized type of A_2 . As before this implies that A_2 is strongly minimal.

Thus, in particular, $SU(A_2) = 1$. Moreover $tp(a/K)$ is trivial, thus 1-based: Indeed, let $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in A_2$ be such that $a_1 \perp_K a_2, a_1 \perp_K a_3$ and $a_3 \perp_K a_2$. We will show that $a_3 \perp_K a_1 a_2$. By 6.1 of [2] $tp_{ACFA}(a_3/Ka_1 a_2)$ is orthogonal to $\text{Fix}\sigma$ and $tp_{ACFA}(Da_1 Da_2 \cdots /Ka_1 a_2)$ is $\text{Fix}\sigma$ -analyzable. Thus, if $a_3 \in \text{acl}(Ka_1 a_2)$, then $a_3 \in \text{acl}_\sigma(Ka_1 a_2)$ and by 6.1 of [2], $a_3 \in \text{acl}_\sigma(Ka_1)$ or $a_3 \in \text{acl}_\sigma(Ka_2)$ which is absurd.

□

Chapter 3

The Dichotomy Theorem

As we mentioned in Chapter 1, *DCF* and *ACFA* satisfy Zilber's dichotomy. The original proofs of these dichotomies involve all the machinery of stability. In [30] Pillay and Ziegler give proofs of these facts using suitable jet spaces from algebraic geometry, in fact they prove stronger results which trivially imply the dichotomies.

In the first part of chapter we adapt this method based on jet spaces to prove an analogue for *DCFA*, but with the additional hypothesis of finite-dimensionality. In the last part we use arc spaces to remove this hypothesis.

3.1 Algebraic Jet Spaces

In this section we list the main properties of jet spaces over algebraically closed fields of characteristic zero. As usual, we will suppose all varieties to be absolutely irreducible.

Definition 3.1.1 *Let K be an algebraically closed field, and let $V \subset \mathbb{A}^n$ be a variety over K^n ; let a be a non singular point of V . Let $\mathcal{O}_{V,a}$ be the local ring of V at a and let $\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}$ be its maximal ideal. Let $m > 0$. The m -th jet space of V at a , $J^m(V)_a$, is the dual space of the K -vector space $\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}/\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}^{m+1}$.*

Notation 3.1.2 *If the variety V is $\mathbb{A}^n$, we write $\mathfrak{M}_a$ instead of $\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}$.*

The following is proved in [30] (Fact 1.2).

Fact 3.1.3 *Let U, V be irreducible varieties of K^n , $a \in V \cap U$. If $J^m(V)_a = J^m(U)_a$ for all $m > 0$, then $V = U$.*

Proposition 3.1.4 *Let V be an variety, a a non-singular point of V . Let $\mathcal{O}_a$ be the local ring of V at a , and $\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}$ its maximal ideal. Let $\mathcal{M}_{V,a} = \{f \in K[V] : f(a) = 0\}$ be the maximal ideal of the coordinate ring of $K[V]$ of V . Then $\mathcal{M}_{V,a}/\mathcal{M}_{V,a}^m$ and $\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}/\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}^m$ are isomorphic K -vector spaces for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof :

This is a consequence from the fact that $\mathcal{M}_{a,V}^i \cap K[V] = \mathfrak{M}_{a,V}^i$ for all i . (cf Proposition 2.2 in [7]) .

□

The following fact is proved in [32], Chapter II, section 5.

Fact 3.1.5 *Let U, V be two irreducible varieties defined over $L \subset K$. Let $f : U \rightarrow V$ be a finite morphism, and let $b \in V$. If f is unramified at b , then, for any $a \in f^{-1}(b)$ and for any positive integer m , the homomorphism $\bar{f} : \mathcal{O}_{V,b}/\mathfrak{M}_{V,b}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{U,a}/\mathfrak{M}_{U,a}^m$ induced by f is an isomorphism.*

Proposition 3.1.6 *Let U, V be two irreducible varieties defined over $L \subset K$. Let $f : U \rightarrow V$ be a dominant generically finite-to-one morphism. Let a be a generic of U over L . Then f induces an isomorphism of K -vector spaces between $J^m(U)_a$ and $J^m(V)_{f(a)}$.*

Proof :

Since f is separable (as we work in characteristic zero), and since f is dominant and $f^{-1}(f(a))$ is finite, U and V are irreducible and their dimensions are equal, thus f is unramified at $f(a)$. By 3.1.5, f induces an isomorphism between $\mathcal{O}_{V,f(a)}/\mathfrak{M}_{V,f(a)}^{m+1}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{U,a}/\mathfrak{M}_{U,a}^{m+1}$; whose restriction to $\mathfrak{M}_{V,f(a)}/\mathfrak{M}_{V,f(a)}^{m+1}$ is an isomorphism between $\mathfrak{M}_{V,f(a)}/\mathfrak{M}_{V,f(a)}^{m+1}$ and $\mathfrak{M}_{U,a}/\mathfrak{M}_{U,a}^{m+1}$. Then, by 3.1.1, f induces an isomorphism between $J^m(U)_a$ and $J^m(V)_{f(a)}$. □

The following lemma (2.3 of [30]) allows us to consider jet spaces as algebraic varieties.

Lemma 3.1.7 *Let K be an algebraically closed field and V a subvariety of K^n , let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of operators*

$$\frac{1}{s_1! \cdots s_n!} \frac{\partial^s}{\partial x_1^{s_1} \cdots \partial x_n^{s_n}}$$

where $0 < s < m + 1$ and $s = s_1 + \cdots + s_n$, $s_i \geq 0$.

Let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in V$; and let $d = |\mathcal{D}|$.

Then we can identify $J^m(V)_a$ with

$$\{(c_h)_{h \in \mathcal{D}} \in K^d : \sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} DP(a)c_h = 0, P \in I(V)\}.$$

Proof :

Let $p : K[X] \rightarrow K[V]$ such that $\text{Ker}(p) = I(V)$; then $p^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_{a,V}) = \mathcal{M}_a$, and $p^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_{a,V}^{m+1}) = \mathcal{M}_a^{m+1} + I(V)$. This gives us the following short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow (I(V) + \mathcal{M}_a^{m+1})/\mathcal{M}_a^{m+1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_a/\mathcal{M}_a^{m+1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{a,V}/\mathcal{M}_{a,V}^{m+1} \longrightarrow 0$$

We proceed to describe the dual space of $\mathcal{M}_a/\mathcal{M}_a^{m+1}$. The monomials $(X - a)^s = (X - a_1)^{s_1} \cdots (X - a_n)^{s_n}$ with $1 \leq s_1 + \cdots + s_n = s \leq m$ form a basis for $\mathcal{M}_a/\mathcal{M}_a^{m+1}$, and for each s we have a K -linear map u_s which assigns 1 to $(X - a)^s$ and 0 to the other monomials. The maps u_s form a basis for the dual of $\mathcal{M}_a/\mathcal{M}_a^{m+1}$.

Thus, the dual $J^m(V)_a$ of $\mathcal{M}_{a,V}/\mathcal{M}_{a,V}^{m+1}$, consists of those linear maps $u : \mathcal{M}_a/\mathcal{M}_a^{m+1} \rightarrow K$ that take the value 0 on $(I(V) + \mathcal{M}_{a,V})/\mathcal{M}_{a,V}^{m+1}$.

Let $f(X) \in K[X]$; applying Taylor's formula we can write, modulo $\mathcal{M}_{a,V}^{m+1}$,

$$f(X) = f(a) + \sum_{1 \leq |s| \leq m} D_s f(a) (X - a)^s,$$

where

$$D_s = \frac{1}{s_1! \cdots s_n!} \frac{\partial^s}{\partial X_1^{s_1} \cdots \partial X_n^{s_n}}$$

If $u = \sum_s c_s u_s$, then u vanishes on $(I(V) + \mathcal{M}_{a,V}^{m+1})/\mathcal{M}_{a,V}^{m+1}$ if and only if for every $P(X) \in I(V)$, we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq |s| \leq m} D_s P(a) c_s = 0.$$

□

3.2 Jet Spaces in Differential and Difference Fields

In this section we study jet spaces of varieties over differential fields and difference fields. We recall the concepts of D -modules and σ -modules (see [30]).

Definition 3.2.1 Let (K, D) be a differential field, and let V be a finite-dimensional K -vector space. We say that (V, D_V) is a D -module over K if D_V is an additive endomorphism of V such that, for any $v \in V$ and $c \in K$, $D_V(cv) = cD_V(v) + (Dc)v$.

Lemma 3.2.2 ([30], 3.1) Let (V, D_V) be a D -module over the differential field (K, D) . Let $(V, D_V)^\sharp = \{v \in V : D_V v = 0\}$. Then $(V, D_V)^\sharp$ is a finite-dimensional $\mathcal{C}$ -vector space. Moreover, if (K, D) is differentially closed, then there is a $\mathcal{C}$ -basis of $(V, D_V)^\sharp$ which is a K -basis of V . (Thus every $\mathcal{C}$ -basis of $(V, D_V)^\sharp$ is a K -basis of V)

Definition 3.2.3 A D -variety is an algebraic variety $V \subset \mathbb{A}^n$ with an algebraic section $s : V \rightarrow \tau_1(V)$ of the projection $\pi : \tau_1(V) \rightarrow V$. Then, by 1.6.22, $(V, s)^\sharp = \{x \in V : Dx = s(x)\}$ is Zariski-dense in V . We shall write $V^\sharp$ when s is understood.

Proposition 3.2.4 A finite-dimensional affine differential algebraic variety is differentially birationally equivalent to a set of the form $(V, s)^\sharp = \{x \in V : Dx = s(x)\}$ where (V, s) is a D -variety.

Remark 3.2.5 Let $V \subset \mathbb{A}^n$ be a variety defined over K .

1. Given a D -variety (V, s) , we can extend the derivation D to the field of rational functions of V as follows:

If $f \in \mathcal{U}(V)$, then we define $Df = \sum \frac{\partial f}{\partial X_i} s_i + f^D$.

2. If $a \in V^\sharp$ and $f \in \mathfrak{M}_{V,a}$, then $Df(a) = \sum \frac{\partial f}{\partial X_i} s_i(a) + f^D(a) = J_f(Da) + f^D(a) = D(f(a)) = 0$. Thus $\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}$ and $\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}^{m+1}$ are differential ideals of $\mathcal{O}_{V,a}$, so it gives $\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}/\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}^{m+1}$ a structure of D -module over $\mathcal{U}$. Defining $D^* : J^m(V)_a \rightarrow J^m(V)_a$ by $D^*(v)(F) = D(v(F)) - v(D(F))$ for $v \in J^m(V)_a$ and $F \in \mathfrak{M}_{V,a}/\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}^{m+1}$, gives $J^m(V)_a$ a structure of D -module.

Definition 3.2.6 Let (K, σ) be a difference field. A σ -module over K is a finite-dimensional K -vector space V together with an additive automorphism $\Sigma : V \rightarrow V$, such that, for all $c \in K$ and $v \in V$, $\Sigma(cv) = \sigma(c)\Sigma(v)$.

Lemma 3.2.7 ([30], 4.2) Let (V, Σ) be a σ -module over the difference field (K, σ) . Let $(V, \Sigma)^\flat = \{v \in V : \Sigma(v) = v\}$. Then $(V, \Sigma)^\flat$ is a finite-dimensional $\text{Fix}\sigma$ -vector space. Moreover, if (K, σ) is a model of ACFA, then there is a $\text{Fix}\sigma$ -basis of $(V, \Sigma)^\flat$ which is a K -basis of V . (Thus every $\text{Fix}\sigma$ -basis of $(V, \Sigma)^\flat$ is a K -basis of V)

Remark 3.2.8 Let (K, σ) be a model of ACFA. Let V, W be two irreducible algebraic affine varieties over K such that $W \subset V \times V^\sigma$, and assume that the projections from W to V and V^σ are dominant and generically finite-to-one. Let $(a, \sigma(a))$ be a generic point of W over K . Then, by 3.1.6, $J^m(W)_{(a, \sigma(a))}$ induces an isomorphism f of K -vector spaces between $J^m(V)_a$ and $J^m(V)_{\sigma(a)}$. We have also that $(J^m(V)_a, f^{-1}\sigma)$ is a σ -module over K .

3.3 Jet Spaces in Difference-Differential Fields

In this section we describe the jet spaces of finite-dimensional varieties defined over difference-differential fields, and we state the results needed to prove our main theorem 3.3.8. Finally we give two corollaries: the first is the weak dichotomy, and the second is an application to quantifier-free definable groups.

We start with the definition of a (σ, D) -module.

Definition 3.3.1 Let (K, σ, D) be a difference-differential field. A (σ, D) -module over K is a finite-dimensional K -vector space V equipped with an additive automorphism $\Sigma : V \rightarrow V$ and an additive endomorphism $D_V : V \rightarrow V$, such that (V, D_V) is a D -module over K , (V, Σ) is a σ -module over K and for all $v \in V$ we have $\Sigma(D_V(v)) = D_V(\Sigma(v))$.

The key point of our proof of 3.3.8 is the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3.2 *Let (V, Σ, D_V) be a (σ, D) -module over the difference-differential field (K, σ, D) . Let $(V, \Sigma, D_V)^\sharp = \{v \in V : D_V(v) = 0 \wedge \Sigma(v) = v\}$ (we shall write $V^\sharp$ when D_V and Σ are understood). Then $V^\sharp$ is a $(\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ -vector space. Moreover, if (K, σ, D) is a model of DCFA, there is a $(\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ -basis of $V^\sharp$ which is a K -basis of V . (Thus every $(\text{Fix}\sigma) \cap \mathcal{C}$ -basis of $(V)^\sharp$ is a K -basis of V)*

Proof :

It is clear that $V^\sharp$ is a $(\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ -vector space. By 3.2.2 and 3.2.7 it is enough to prove that there is a $(\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ -basis of $V^\sharp$ which is a $\mathcal{C}$ -basis of $V^\sharp$.

Let $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ be a $\mathcal{C}$ -basis of $V^\sharp$, then $\{\Sigma(v_1), \dots, \Sigma(v_k)\}$ is a $\mathcal{C}$ -basis of $V^\sharp$. Let A be the invertible $k \times k$ $\mathcal{C}$ -matrix such that $[\Sigma(v_i)]^t = A[v_i]^t$.

Let $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ be a $\mathcal{C}$ -basis of $V^\sharp$. Then there exists an invertible $k \times k$ $\mathcal{C}$ -matrix B such that $[u_i]^t = B[v_i]^t$; applying Σ we get $[\Sigma(u_i)]^t = \sigma(B)[\Sigma(v_i)]^t = \sigma(B)A[v_i]^t$. Thus $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ is in $V^\sharp$ if and only if $B = \sigma(B)A$. Since $(\mathcal{C}, \sigma) \models \text{ACFA}$, the system $X = \sigma(X)A$, where X is an invertible $k \times k$ matrix, has a solution in $\mathcal{C}$. So we can suppose that $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ is in $V^\sharp$.

Let $v \in V^\sharp$, and let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $v = \lambda_1 u_1 + \dots + \lambda_k u_k$. Then $v = \sigma(\lambda_1)u_1 + \dots + \sigma(\lambda_k)u_k$, thus $\lambda_i \in \text{Fix}\sigma$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Hence $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ is a $(\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ -basis of $V^\sharp$.

□

Notation 3.3.3 *Let $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$ be a saturated model of DCFA. Let $K = \text{acl}(K)$ be a difference-differential subfield of $\mathcal{U}$, and let $a \in \mathcal{U}^n$ such that $K(a)_D = K(a)$ and $\sigma(a) \in K(a)^{\text{alg}}$.*

Let V be the locus of a over K , and let W be the locus of $(a, \sigma(a))$ over K . Then V^σ is the locus of $\sigma(a)$ over K and the projections $\pi_1 : W \rightarrow V$ and $\pi_2 : W \rightarrow V^\sigma$ are generically finite-to-one and dominant.

We set:

$$\pi_1^* : K[V] \rightarrow K[W], F \mapsto F \circ \pi_1.$$

$$\pi_2^* : K[V^\sigma] \rightarrow K[W], G \mapsto G \circ \pi_2.$$

$$\overline{\pi_1^*} : \mathfrak{M}_{V,a}/\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}^{m+1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{W,(a,\sigma(a))}/\mathfrak{M}_{W,(a,\sigma(a))}^{m+1} \text{ the map induced by } \pi_1^*$$

$$\overline{\pi_2^*} : \mathfrak{M}_{V^\sigma,\sigma(a)}/\mathfrak{M}_{V^\sigma,\sigma(a)}^{m+1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{W,(a,\sigma(a))}/\mathfrak{M}_{W,(a,\sigma(a))}^{m+1} \text{ the map induced by } \pi_2^*$$

$$\pi_1' : J^m(W)_{(a,\sigma(a))} \rightarrow J^m(V)_a, w \mapsto w \circ \overline{\pi_1^*}.$$

$$\pi_2' : J^m(W)_{(a,\sigma(a))} \rightarrow J^m(V^\sigma)_{\sigma(a)}, w \mapsto w \circ \overline{\pi_2^*}.$$

With respect to the extension of D to the coordinate rings, π_1^* and π_2^* are differential homomorphisms. By 3.1.6 π_1' and π_2' are isomorphisms of $\mathcal{U}$ -vector spaces.

Let $f : J^m(V)_a \rightarrow J^m(V^\sigma)_{\sigma(a)}$ be the $\mathcal{U}$ -isomorphism defined by $f = \pi_2' \circ (\pi_1')^{-1}$.

Since $Da \in K(a)$ there is a rational map $s : V \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^n$ such that $s(a) = Da$ and (V, s) is a D -variety. By construction (V^σ, s^σ) and $(W, (s, s^\sigma))$ are also D -varieties.

Lemma 3.3.4 *$(J^m(V)_a, f^{-1}\sigma, D^*)$ is a (σ, D) -module.*

Proof :

All we need to prove is that D^* commutes with $f^{-1}\sigma$. Since $f = \pi'_2 \circ (\pi'_1)^{-1}$ and π'_1, π'_2 are isomorphisms, and since σ commutes with D^* , it is enough to prove that D^* commutes with π'_1 and π'_2 .

Let $w \in J^m(W)_{(a, \sigma(a))}$ and $F \in \mathfrak{M}_{V,a}/\mathfrak{M}_{V,a}^{m+1}$.

We want to prove that $D^*(\pi'_1(w))(F) = (\pi'_1 \circ D^*(w))(F)$. We have $D^*(\pi'_1(w))(F) = D^*(w \circ \overline{\pi_1^*})(F) = D((w \circ \overline{\pi_1^*})(F)) - w \circ \overline{\pi_1^*}(D(F))$.

On the other hand $\pi'_1(D^*(w))(F) = (D^*(w) \circ \overline{\pi_1^*})(F) = D(w(\overline{\pi_1^*}(F))) - w(D_W(\overline{\pi_1^*}(F)))$.

But clearly $D((w \circ \overline{\pi_1^*})(F)) = D(w(\overline{\pi_1^*}(F)))$ and $w \circ \overline{\pi_1^*}(D(F)) = w(D_V(\overline{\pi_1^*}(F)))$.

The proof is similar for π'_2 .

□

Lemma 3.3.5 *Let $K \subset K_1 = \text{acl}(K_1)$. Let V_1 be the (σ, D) -locus of a over K_1 , and let c be the field of definition of V_1 . Then $c \subset \text{Cb}(qftp(a/K_1)) \subset \text{acl}(K, c)$.*

Proof :

Clearly $c \subset \text{Cb}(qftp(a/K_1))$. We know that $a \downarrow_{K,c} K_1$ in DCF , also $\sigma^i(D^j a) \subset K(a)^{alg}$; then $\text{acl}_{\sigma,D}(K, a) \downarrow_{K,c} K_1$ in ACF , thus $\text{Cb}(qftp(a/K_1)) \subset \text{acl}(K, c)$.

□

Remark 3.3.6 *If we replace a by $(a, \sigma(a), \dots, \sigma^m(a))$ for m large enough, c and $\text{Cb}(qftp(a/K_1))$ will be interdefinable over K (choose m for which the Morley rank of $tp_{DCF}(\sigma^m(a)/K(a, \dots, \sigma^{m-1}(a)))$ is minimal and for which the Morley degree of $tp_{DCF}(\sigma^m(a)/K(a, \dots, \sigma^{m-1}(a)))$ is minimal).*

Lemma 3.3.7 *Let $K \subset K_1 = \text{acl}(K_1)$. Let V_1 be the locus of a over K_1 . Then $J^m(V_1)_a$ is a (σ, D) -submodule of $J^m(V)_a$.*

Proof :

Clearly $J(V_1)_a$ is a D -submodule of $J^m(V)_a$. Let W_1 be the locus of $(a, \sigma(a))$ over K_1 . Let f_1 be the isomorphism between $J^m(V_1)_a$ and $J^m(V_1^\sigma)_{\sigma(a)}$ induced by the projections from W_1 onto V_1 and $(V_1)^\sigma$; since these projections are the restrictions of the projections from W onto V and V^σ , $f_1 \subset f$. So $J^m(V_1)_a$ is a σ -submodule of $J^m(V)_a$.

□

Theorem 3.3.8 *Let $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$ be a saturated model of $DCFA$ and let $K = \text{acl}(K) \subset \mathcal{U}$. Let $tp(a/K)$ be finite-dimensional (i.e. $\text{tr.dg}(K(a)_{\sigma,D}/K) < \infty$). Let b be such that $b = \text{Cb}(qftp(a/\text{acl}(K, b)))$. Then $tp(b/\text{acl}(K, a))$ is almost-internal to $\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$.*

Proof :

By assumption, $\text{trdeg}(K(a)_{\sigma,D}/K)$ is finite. Enlarging a , we may assume that a contains a transcendence basis of $K(a)_{\sigma,D}$ over K . Then $\sigma(a), Da \in K(a)^{\text{alg}}$ and $D^2(a) \in K(a, Da)$. Hence we may assume that $Da \in K(a)$.

Let V be the locus of a over K , W the locus of $(a, \sigma(a))$ over K , thus V^σ is the locus of $\sigma(a)$ over K .

Let V_1 be the locus of a over $\text{acl}(K, b)$; let b_1 be the field of definition of V_1 . By 3.3.5 $b \in \text{acl}(K, b_1)$.

By 3.3.2 for each $m > 1$ there is a $(\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ -basis of $J^m(V)_a^{\mathfrak{h}}$ which is a $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of $J^m(V)_a$. Choose such a basis d_m such that $d = (d_1, d_2, \dots) \perp_{K,a} b$. Then for each m we have an isomorphism between $J^m(V)_a^{\mathfrak{h}}$ and $(\mathcal{C} \cap \text{Fix}\sigma)^{r_m}$ for some r_m . Thus the image of $J^m(V_1)_a^{\mathfrak{h}}$ in $(\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})^{r_m}$ is a $(\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ -subspace of $(\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})^{r_m}$ and therefore it is defined over some tuple $e_m \subset \text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$; let $e = (e_1, e_2, \dots)$. If τ is an automorphism of $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$ fixing K, a, d, e , then $J^m(V_1)_a = \tau(J^m(V_1)_a)$; on the other hand, $\tau(J^m(V_1)_a) = J^m(\tau(V_1))_a$, thus for all $m > 1$, $J^m(V_1)_a = J^m(\tau(V_1))_a$ and by 3.1.3 $\tau(V_1) = V_1$, thus $\tau(b_1) = b_1$ which implies that $b_1 \in \text{dcl}(K, a, d, e)$. Hence $b \in \text{acl}(K, a, d, e)$. Since $e \subset \text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$ and $d \perp_{K,a} b$, this proves our assertion.

□

As in [27], we deduce the dichotomy theorem.

Corollary 3.3.9 *If $\text{tp}(a/K)$ is of SU -rank 1 and finite-dimensional, then it is either 1-based or non-orthogonal to $\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$.*

Proof:

We suppress the set of parameters. Let $p = \text{tp}(a)$. If p is not 1-based there is a tuple of realizations d of p and a tuple c such that $c = \text{Cb}(qftp(d/c)) \notin \text{acl}(d)$. Then $\text{tp}(c/d)$ is non-algebraic and by 3.3.8 it is almost-internal to $\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$. As $\text{tp}(c/d)$ is p -internal we have $p \not\perp \text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$.

□

We conclude with an application to definable groups of $DCFA$. We need quantifier-free versions of 1.4.6 and 1.4.7.

Lemma 3.3.10 *Let M be a simple quantifier-free stable structure which eliminates imaginaries. Let G be a connected group, quantifier-free definable in M defined over $A = \text{acl}(A) \subset M$. Let $c \in G$ and let H be the left stabilizer of $p(x) = qftp(c/A)$. Let $a \in G$ and b realize a non-forking extension of $p(x)$ to $\text{acl}(Aa)$. Then aH is interdefinable over A with $\text{Cb}(qftp(a \cdot b/A, a))$. Likewise with right stabilizers and cosets in place of left ones, and $b \cdot a$ instead of $a \cdot b$.*

Proof:

Let q be the quantifier-free type over M which is the non-forking extension of p . Then aq is the non-forking extension to M of $qftp(a \cdot b/Aa)$. So we must prove that for every automorphism $\tau \in \text{Aut}(M/A)$, $\tau(aH) = aH$ if and only if $\tau(aq) = aq$.

Since q is A -definable, $\tau(q) = q$, and $\tau(aq) = \tau(a)\tau(q) = \tau(a)q$. Thus $\tau(aq) = aq$ if and only if $a^{-1}\tau(a)q = q$. But $H = \{x \in G : xq = q\}$, then $a^{-1}\tau(a) \in H$ if and only if $\tau(a)H = aH$, and as H is Aa -definable, $\tau(aH) = \tau(a)H$.

□

Lemma 3.3.11 *Let M be a simple quantifier-free stable structure which eliminates imaginaries. Let G be a connected group, quantifier-free definable in M defined over $A = \text{acl}(A) \subset M$. Let $c \in G$, let H be the left stabilizer of $\text{qftp}(c/A)$ and let $a \in G$ be a generic over $A \cup \{c\}$. Then Hc is interdefinable with $Cb(\text{qftp}(a/A, c \cdot a))$ over $A \cup \{a\}$*

Proof :

We may assume $A = \emptyset$. Let $p = \text{qftp}(c/A)$. We know that H is the right stabilizer of p^{-1} , on the other hand, since a is a generic of G we have $c \perp_c a$. By 3.3.10, $Hc \cdot a$ is interdefinable with $Cb(\text{qftp}(c^{-1}(c \cdot a)/c \cdot a))$. Since H is $\emptyset$ -definable, $Hc \cdot a$ is interdefinable with Hc over a .

□

Corollary 3.3.12 *Let $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$ be a model of DCFA, and let $K = \text{acl}(K) \subset \mathcal{U}$. Let G be a finite-dimensional quantifier-free definable group, defined over K . Let $a \in G$ and let $p(x) = \text{qftp}(a/K)$. Assume that p has trivial stabilizer. Then p is internal to $\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$.*

Proof :

Let $b \in G$ be a generic over $K \cup \{a\}$. By 3.3.11 a is interdefinable with $Cb(\text{qftp}(b/K, a \cdot b))$ over $K \cup \{b\}$ and by 3.3.8, $tp(Cb(\text{qftp}(b/K, a \cdot b))/K, b)$ is internal to $\mathcal{C} \cap \text{Fix}\sigma$. Thus $tp(a/K, b)$ is internal to $\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$; and since $a \perp_K b$, $tp(a/K)$ is internal to $\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$.

□

3.4 Arc Spaces in Difference-Differential Fields

In [22] Moosa, Pillay and Scanlon prove a dichotomy theorem for fields with finitely many commuting derivations. We adapt their proof to our case.

Let K be a field, and $K^{(m)}$ the K -algebra $K[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^{m+1})$. Then, identifying $K^{(m)}$ with $K \cdot 1 \oplus K \cdot \epsilon \dots \oplus K \cdot \epsilon^m$, we see that the K -algebra $K^{(m)}$ is quantifier-free interpretable in K , if one encodes elements of $K^{(m)}$ by $(m+1)$ -tuples of K .

Let $V \subset \mathbb{A}^\ell$ be a variety defined over K . For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the set $V(K^{(m)})$ of $K^{(m)}$ -rational points of V .

Using the quantifier-free interpretation of $K^{(m)}$ in K , we may (and will) identify $V(K^{(m)})$ with a subvariety $\mathcal{A}_m V(K)$ of $\mathbb{A}^{(m+1)\ell}(K)$. The variety $\mathcal{A}_m V$ is called the m -th arc bundle of V . More precisely, if $f_1, \dots, f_k \in K[X_1, \dots, X_\ell]$ generate the ideal $I(V)$, then

the ideal of $\mathcal{A}_m V$ is generated by the polynomials $f_{j,t} \in K[X_{i,t} | 1 \leq i \leq \ell, 0 \leq t \leq m]$, $1 \leq j \leq k, 0 \leq t \leq m$, which are defined by the identity

$$f_j((\sum_{t=0}^m x_{i,t} \epsilon^t)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}) = \sum_{t=0}^m f_{j,t}(x_{i,t_{1 \leq i \leq \ell, 0 \leq t \leq m}}) \epsilon^t.$$

If $r > m$, the natural map $K^{(r)} \rightarrow K^{(m)}$ then induces a map $V(K^{(r)}) \rightarrow V(K^{(m)})$, which in turn induces a morphism $\rho_{r,m} : \mathcal{A}_r V \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_m V$.

Moreover, given a morphism of varieties $f : U \rightarrow V$ defined over K , the natural morphism $U(K^{(m)}) \rightarrow V(K^{(m)})$ induced by f gives rise to a morphism $\mathcal{A}_m f : \mathcal{A}_m U \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_m V$.

Let us write ρ_m for $\rho_{m,0}$. For $a \in V(K)$ the m -th arc space of V at a , $\mathcal{A}_m V_a$ is the fiber of ρ_m over a . The following three results appear in [22].

Lemma 3.4.1 *Let U, V be two algebraic varieties, and let $f : U \rightarrow V$ be a morphism, all defined over K . Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}_m U(K)$ be such that for all m , $\bar{a} = \rho_m(a)$ and $f(\bar{a}) = \rho_m(f(a))$ are non-singular. Let U' be the fiber of $\rho_{m+1,m} : \mathcal{A}_{m+1} U \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_m U$ over a and V' the fiber of $\rho_{m+1,m} : \mathcal{A}_{m+1} V \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_m V$ over $\mathcal{A}_m f(a)$. Let $\bar{a} = \rho_m(a)$. Then there are biregular maps $\varphi_U : U' \rightarrow T(U)_{\bar{a}}$ and $\varphi_V : V' \rightarrow T(V)_{f(\bar{a})}$ such that the following diagram is commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U' & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}_m(f)} & V' \\ \downarrow \varphi_U & & \downarrow \varphi_V \\ T(U)_{\bar{a}} & \xrightarrow{df_{\bar{a}}} & T(V)_{f(\bar{a})} \end{array}$$

Lemma 3.4.2 *Let U, V be algebraic varieties defined over K , and let $f : U \rightarrow V$ be a dominant map defined over K . Let $a \in U(K)$ be non-singular such that $f(a)$ is non-singular and the rank of df_a equals $\dim V$. Then for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the map $\mathcal{A}_m(f) : \mathcal{A}_m U_a(K) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_m V_{f(a)}(K)$ is surjective.*

Lemma 3.4.3 *Let U, V, W be algebraic varieties defined over K such that $U, V \subset W$. Let $a \in U(K) \cap V(K)$ be non-singular. Then $U = V$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}_m U_a(K) = \mathcal{A}_m V_a(K)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Let $\nabla_m : V \rightarrow \tau_m(V)$ be defined by $x \mapsto (x, Dx, \dots, D^m x)$ and let $\pi_{l,m} : \tau_l(V) \rightarrow \tau_m(V)$ be the natural projection for $l \geq m$. $S_m(V)$ will denote the Zariski closure of $\{(x, \dots, \sigma^m(x)) : x \in V\}$. Let $q_m : V \rightarrow S_m(V)$ be defined by $x \mapsto (x, \dots, \sigma^m(x))$ and let $p_{l,m} : S_l(V) \rightarrow S_m(V)$ be the natural projections for $l \geq m$.

We now define a notion of difference-differential prolongation.

Let $\Phi_m(V) = \tau_m(S_m(V))$, let $\psi_m : V \rightarrow \Phi_m(V)$ be such that $x \mapsto \nabla_m(q_m(x))$ and for $l \geq m$ let $t_{l,m} : \Phi_l(V) \rightarrow \Phi_m(V)$ be defined by $t_{l,m} = \pi_{l,m} \circ p_{l,m}$. Let us denote $\pi_l = \pi_{l,0}$, $p_l = p_{l,0}$, $t_l = t_{l,0}$, $\Phi(V) = \Phi^1(V) = \Phi_1(V)$ and $\Phi^{m+1}(V) = \Phi(\Phi^m(V))$. We define $\psi = \psi^1 = \psi_1 : V \rightarrow \Phi(V)$ and $\psi^{m+1}(V) = \psi(\psi^m) : V \rightarrow \Phi^{m+1}(V)$.

Let $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$ be a saturated model of $DCFA$, let K be a difference-differential subfield of $\mathcal{U}$. We can identify $\tau_m(\mathcal{A}_r V)(K)$ with $\mathcal{A}_r \tau_m(V)(K)$.

We extend σ and D to $K^{(m)}$ by defining $\sigma(\epsilon) = \epsilon$ and $D\epsilon = 0$. Then we can identify $\mathcal{A}_r(S_m(V))(K)$ with $S_m(\mathcal{A}_r(V))(K)$. We can, then, identify $\mathcal{A}_r(\Phi_m(V))(K)$ with $\Phi_m(\mathcal{A}_m(V))(K)$.

Let V be a (σ, D) -variety given as a (σ, D) -closed subset of an algebraic variety $\bar{V}$. We define $\Phi_m(V)$ as the Zariski closure of $\psi_m(V)$ in $\Phi_m(\bar{V})$. Thus V is determined by the prolongation sequence $\{t_{l,m} : \Phi_l(V) \rightarrow \Phi_m(V) : l \geq m\}$, since $V(\mathcal{U}) = \{a \in \bar{V}(\mathcal{U}) : \psi_l(a) \in \Phi_l(V) \forall l\}$. We call this sequence the prolongation sequence of V .

Proposition 3.4.4 *Let $\{V_l \subset \Phi_l(\bar{V}) : l \geq 0\}$ be a sequence of algebraic varieties and $\{t_{m,l} : V_m \rightarrow V_l, m \geq l\}$ a sequence of morphisms such that:*

1. $t_{l+1,l} \upharpoonright V_{l+1} \rightarrow V_l$ is dominant.
2. After embedding $\Phi_l(\bar{V})$ in $\Phi^l(\bar{V})$ and $\Phi_{l+1}(\bar{V})$ in $\Phi^{l+1}(\bar{V})$,
 - (a) V_{l+1} is a subvariety of $\Phi(V_l)$.
 - (b) Let $\pi'_1 : \Phi(V_l) \rightarrow \tau(V_l)$ and $\pi'_2 : \Phi(V_l) \rightarrow \tau(V_l^\sigma)$ be the projections induced by $\Phi(V_l) \subset \tau(V_l) \times \tau(V_l^\sigma)$; then $\pi'_1(V_{l+1})^\sigma$ and $\pi'_2(V_{l+1})$ have the same Zariski closure.

Then there is a (unique) (σ, D) -variety V with prolongation sequence $\{t_{m,l} : V_m \rightarrow V_l, m \geq l\}$.

Proof:

We work now in a saturated model $\mathcal{U}$ of $DCFA$. For each l , as the maps $\pi_{m,j}$ are dominant, the system $\{p_{m,l}(V_m), \pi_{m,j} : m > j \geq l\}$ defines a differential subvariety W_l of $\bar{V} \times \cdots \times \bar{V}^{\sigma^l}$. Condition (1) implies that for m sufficiently large, an (m, D) -generic of $p_{m,l+1}(V)$ is sent by $p_{l+1,l}$ to an (m, D) -generic of $p_{m,l}(V)$. Hence, a D -generic of W_{l+1} is sent by $p_{l+1,l}$ to a D -generic of W_l .

By conditions (2) (b) and (1), the map $t'_{l+1,l} : V_{l+1} \rightarrow V_l^\sigma$ induced by $\Phi(V_l) \rightarrow V_l^\sigma$ is dominant. Hence, considering the natural projection $p'_{l+1,l} : S_{l+1}(\bar{V}) \rightarrow S_l(\bar{V})^\sigma$, and reasoning as above, we obtain that $p'_{l+1,l}$ sends a D -generic of W_{l+1} to a D -generic of W_l^σ . Hence by the axioms of $DCFA$, for every l there is a such that $\psi_l(a)$ is a generic of V_l over K . By saturation, there is a such that for all l $\psi_l(a)$ is a generic of V_l . Then $\{t_{m,l} : V_m \rightarrow V_l, m \geq l\}$ is the prolongation sequence of the (σ, D) -locus of a over K .

□

Definition 3.4.5 *Let V be a (σ, D) -subvariety of the algebraic variety $\bar{V}$. We say that a point $a \in V$ is non-singular if, for all l , $\psi_l(a)$ is a non-singular point of $\Phi_l(V)$, the maps $dt_{l+1,l}$ and $dt'_{l+1,l}$ at $\psi_{l+1}(a)$ have rank equal to $\dim V_l$ and the maps $d\pi'_1$ and $d\pi'_2$ (as defined above) at $\psi_{l+1}(a)$ have rank equal to the dimension of the Zariski closure of $\pi'_1(\Phi_{l+1}(V))$.*

Proposition 3.4.6 *Let (K, σ, D) be a model of DCFA. Let V be a (σ, D) -variety given as a closed subvariety of an algebraic variety $\bar{V}$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in V(K)$ a non-singular point. Then $\{\mathcal{A}_m(t_{r,s}) : \mathcal{A}_m\Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_m\Phi_s(V)_{\psi_s(a)}, r \geq s\}$ form the (σ, D) -prolongation sequence of a (σ, D) -subvariety of $\mathcal{A}_m\bar{V}_a$. We define the m -th arc space of V at a , $\mathcal{A}_mV_a$, to be this subvariety. We have also that $\Phi_r(\mathcal{A}_mV_a) = \mathcal{A}_m\Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)}$ for all r .*

Proof:

Since we can identify $\mathcal{A}_m\Phi_r(\bar{V})$ with $\Phi_r(\mathcal{A}_m\bar{V})$, we look at $\mathcal{A}_m\Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)}$ as an algebraic subvariety of $\Phi_r(\mathcal{A}_m\bar{V})_{\psi_r(a)}$. We have that $\Phi_{r+1}(V) \subset \Phi(\Phi_r(V))$ for all r . Since $\mathcal{A}$ preserves inclusion we have $\mathcal{A}_m\Phi_{r+1}(V)_{\psi_{r+1}(a)} \subset \mathcal{A}_m\Phi(\Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)}) = \Phi(\mathcal{A}_m\Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)})$. This shows conditions 1 and 2(a).

Moreover, the maps $t_{r,s} : \Phi_r(V) \rightarrow \Phi_s(V)$ are dominant, and by 3.4.2, the maps $\mathcal{A}(t_{r,s}) : \mathcal{A}_m\Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_m\Phi_s(V)_{\psi_s(a)}$, are dominant. Applying $\mathcal{A}_m$ to the dominant maps $\pi'_1 : \Phi_{r+1}(V) \rightarrow \tau(\Phi_r(V))$ and $\pi'_2 : \Phi_{r+1}(V) \rightarrow \tau(\Phi_r(V))^\sigma$, using the hypothesis on a and 3.4.2, we get

$$\mathcal{A}_m\pi'_1(\mathcal{A}_m(\Phi_{r+1}(V)_{\psi_{r+1}(a)})) = \mathcal{A}_m(\pi'_1(\Phi_{r+1}(V))_{\pi'_1(\psi_{r+1}(a))})$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_m\pi'_2(\mathcal{A}_m(\Phi_{r+1}(V)_{\psi_{r+1}(a)})) = \mathcal{A}_m(\pi'_2(\Phi_{r+1}(V))_{\pi'_2(\psi_{r+1}(a))})$$

and since $\pi'_1(\Phi_{r+1}(V))^\sigma$ and $\pi'_2(\Phi_{r+1}(V))$ have the same Zariski closure, and $\sigma(\pi'_1\psi_{r+1}(a)) = \pi'_2\psi_{r+1}(a)$ we get condition 2(b).

Hence $\{\mathcal{A}_m(t_{r,s}) : \mathcal{A}_m\Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_m\Phi_s(V)_{\psi_s(a)}, r \geq s\}$ is the (σ, D) -prolongation sequence of a (σ, D) -subvariety W of $\mathcal{A}_m\bar{V}_a$, where $W(K) = \{x \in \mathcal{A}_m\bar{V}_a(K) : \psi_r(x) \in \mathcal{A}_m\Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)}(K), r \geq 0\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_m\Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)} = \Phi_r(W)$ for all r . We define then $\mathcal{A}_mV_a = W$.

□

Lemma 3.4.7 *Let U, V be two (σ, D) -subvarieties of an algebraic variety $\bar{V}$. Let $a \in U(K) \cap V(K)$ be a non-singular point of U . Then $U = V$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}_m\Phi_l(U)_{\psi_l(a)} = \mathcal{A}_m\Phi_l(V)_{\psi_l(a)}$ for all m, l .*

Proof:

If $\mathcal{A}_mU_a(K) = \mathcal{A}_mV_a(K)$ for all m , then $\Phi_r(\mathcal{A}_mU_a)(K) = \Phi_r(\mathcal{A}_mV_a)(K)$. Thus, by 3.4.6, $\mathcal{A}_m\Phi_r(U)_{\psi_r(a)}(K) = \mathcal{A}_m\Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)}(K)$. Hence, for all r and m , we have $\mathcal{A}_m\Phi_r(U)_{\psi_r(a)} = \mathcal{A}_m\Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)}$. Lemma 3.4.3 implies that U and V have the same (σ, D) -prolongation sequence. Hence $U = V$.

□

Definition 3.4.8 *Let V be a variety and a a non-singular point of V . We define the (σ, D) -tangent space $T_{\sigma, D}(V)_a$ of V at a as follows:*

Let P_r be a finite tuple of polynomials generating $I(\Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)})$. Then $T_{\sigma,D}(V)_a$ is defined by the equations $J_{P_r}(\psi_r(a)) \cdot (\psi_r(Y)) = 0$. In other words, the prolongation sequence of $T_{\sigma,D}(V)_a$ is $dt_{l,r} : T(\Phi_l(V))_{\psi_l(a)} \rightarrow T(\Phi_r(V))_{\psi_r(a)}, l \geq r$, where T denotes the usual tangent bundle and $t_{l,r}$ the natural projection $\Phi_l(V)_{\psi_l(a)} \rightarrow \Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)}$.

Remark 3.4.9 Let a be a non-singular point of the (σ, D) -variety V . Then $T_{\sigma,D}(V)_a$ is a subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_a^n(K)$, and by the same arguments as above, its prolongation sequence is $(d(t_{l,r})_{\psi_l(a)} : T(\Phi_l(V))_{\psi_l(a)} \rightarrow T(\Phi_r(V))_{\psi_r(a)})_{l \geq r}$.

Lemma 3.4.10 Let V be a (σ, D) -variety in $\mathbb{A}^l$ and a a non-singular point of V . Then $\mathcal{A}_1 V_a$ is isomorphic to $T(V)_a$. Let $\bar{V}$ be the Zariski closure of $V(\mathcal{U})$ in $\mathbb{A}^l$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$; then the map given by lemma 3.4.1 which identifies the fibers of $\mathcal{A}_{m+1} \bar{V}_a \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_m \bar{V}_a$ with $T(\bar{V})_a$ restricts to an isomorphism of the fibers of $\mathcal{A}_{m+1} V_a \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_m V_a$ with $T(V)_a$.

Proof:

We identify $\mathcal{A}_1 \bar{V}$ with $T(\bar{V})$. Let $b \in T(\bar{V})_a(K)$. By definition $(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_1 V(\mathcal{U})$ if and only if $\psi_r(a, b) \in T(\Phi_r(V))(K)$ for all r . We view $T(\Phi_r(V))_{\psi_r(a)}$ as an algebraic subvariety of $\Phi_r(T(\bar{V}))$ under the identification of $T(\Phi_r(\bar{V}))$ with $\Phi_r(T(\bar{V}))$; in particular we identify $\psi_r(a, b)$ with $(\psi_r(a), \psi_r(b))$. Hence $b \in \mathcal{A}_1 V_a(K)$ if and only if $b \in T(V)_b$ and the first part of the theorem is proved.

Now we look at the map given in 3.4.1. In particular, if $c \in \mathcal{A}_m V_a(K)$ and $r \geq 0$, by 3.4.6, $\psi_r(c) \in \mathcal{A}_m \Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)}$ and the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathcal{A}_{m+1} \bar{V}_a)_c & \longrightarrow & (\mathcal{A}_{m+1} \Phi_r(\bar{V})_{\psi_r(a)})_{\psi_r(c)} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ T(\bar{V})_a & \longrightarrow & T(\Phi_r(\bar{V}))_{\psi_r(a)} \end{array}$$

where the horizontal arrows are ψ_r and the vertical arrows are the maps given by 3.4.1 applied to $\bar{V}$ and $\Phi_r(\bar{V})$. So $(\mathcal{A}_{m+1} V_a)_c$ is identified with $T_{\sigma,D}(V)_a$.

□

Notation and Definition 3.4.11 In analogy with the material of [14], section 0.3, since the (σ, D) -topology is Noetherian, given a difference-differential subfield F of K and $a \in K$ there is a numerical polynomial $P_{a/F}(X) \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$ of degree at most 2, such that for sufficiently large $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $P_{a/F}(r) = \text{tr.dg}(\psi_r(a)/F)$. We call the degree of $P_{a/F}$ the (σ, D) -type of a over F , and the leading coefficient of $P_{a/F}$ the (σ, D) -dimension of a over F , it is denoted $\dim_{\sigma,D}(a/F)$. For a (σ, D) -variety V defined over F we define $P_V = P_{a/F}$ where a is a (σ, D) -generic of V over F . We have that the (σ, D) -type of a over F is 2 if and only if a contains an element which is (σ, D) -transcendental over F .

Let $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$ be a saturated model of DCFA, let $F = \text{acl}(F) \subset \mathcal{U}$. Let $a \in \mathcal{U}$ and let $p = \text{tp}(a/F)$. We denote by $m(p)$ (or by $m(a/F)$) the (σ, D) -type of a over F and we

write $\dim_{\sigma,D}(p)$ for $\dim_{\sigma,D}(a/F)$. If p' is a non-forking extension of p then $m(p) = m(p')$ and $\dim_{\sigma,D}(p) = \dim_{\sigma,D}(p')$. If A is an arbitrary subset of $\mathcal{U}$ we write $m(a/A)$ instead of $m(a/\text{acl}(A))$.

If V is a (σ, D) -variety over K , $m(V)$ denotes the (σ, D) -type of V . Then, if a is a (σ, D) -generic of V , $m(V) = m(\text{qftp}(a/F))$.

Corollary 3.4.12 . Let V be a (σ, D) -variety in $\mathbb{A}^l$, and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for $a \in V(K)$ non-singular, the (σ, D) -type of V and $\mathcal{A}_m V_a$ are equal.

Proof.

By 3.4.6 $\Phi_r(\mathcal{A}_m V_a) = \mathcal{A}_m \Phi_r(V)_{\psi_r(a)}$. But if b is a non-singular point of a variety U , then we have $\dim(\mathcal{A}_m U_b) = m \dim(U)$.

□

Remark 3.4.13 By 3.4.10, for $m = 1$ and for $a \in V(K)$ non-singular, we have $P_V = P_{T(V)_a}$.

Lemma 3.4.14 Let $F = \text{acl}(F)$. Then

1. $m(a, b/F) = \max\{m(a/F), m(b/F)\}$.
2. If $m(a/F) = m(b/F)$ then $\dim_{\sigma,D}(a, b/F) = \dim_{\sigma,D}(a/F) + \dim_{\sigma,D}(b/Fa)$.
3. If $m(a/F) > m(b/F)$ then $\dim_{\sigma,D}(a, b/F) = \dim_{\sigma,D}(a/F)$.

Proof.

It suffices to compute the degree and the leading coefficient of the respective polynomials.

□

Definition 3.4.15 Let p be a regular type. We say that p is (σ, D) -type minimal if for any type q , $p \not\leq q$ implies $m(q) \geq m(p)$.

Definition 3.4.16 A (σ, D) -variety V is (σ, D) -type minimal if for every proper (σ, D) -subvariety U , $m(V) < m(U)$.

Lemma 3.4.17 Let p be a type and let V be the (σ, D) -locus of p over K (i.e. the Kolchin closure of the set of a realizations of p) If V is (σ, D) -type minimal then p is regular and (σ, D) -type minimal.

Proof.

Let a be a realization of a forking extension of p to some $L = \text{acl}(L) \supset K$. Let b realize a nonforking extension of p to L . Let U be the (σ, D) -locus of (a, b) over L . Then the projection on the second coordinate: $U \rightarrow V$ is dominant, thus $m(a, b/L) \geq m(V)$. Now if $a \not\leq_L b$, then the (σ, D) -locus of b over $\text{acl}(La)$ is a proper subvariety of V and therefore $m(b/La) < m(V)$; from $m(a/L) < m(V)$, we deduce $m(a, b/L) < m(V)$ which is impossible.

□

Lemma 3.4.18 *If p is a type over K , there is a finite sequence of regular types $p_1, \dots, p_k$ such that $m(p) \geq m(p_i)$ for all i and p is domination-equivalent to $p_1 \times \dots \times p_k$.*

Proof:

By 1.2.18 it suffices to show that given a regular type q , such that $p \not\leq q$, there is a regular type r such that $q \not\leq r$ and $m(r) \leq m(p)$. Let a be a realization of a nonforking extension of p to some L and let b be a realization of a nonforking extension of q to L such that $a \not\perp_L b$. Let $c = Cb(tp(a/L, b))$. Thus $c \notin acl(L)$ and $c \in acl(Lb)$. So $r = tp(c/L)$ is regular (because $c \in acl(Lb)$) and non-orthogonal to q . On the other hand, there are $a_1, \dots, a_l$ realizations of p such that $c \in dcl(La_1 \dots a_l)$. Then, by 3.4.14, $m(r) \leq m(q)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.4.19 *Let G be a (σ, D) -vector group (that is, a (σ, D) -variety which is a subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_a^k$ for some k). Then $T_{\sigma, D}(G)_0$ is definably isomorphic to G . Moreover, if H is a (σ, D) -subgroup of G , then the restriction of this isomorphism to H is an isomorphism between H and $T_{\sigma, D}(H)_0$.*

Proof:

Suppose that G is a (σ, D) -subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_a^k$. For each $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Phi_r(G)$ is a subgroup of $\Phi_r(\mathbb{G}_a^k) = \mathbb{G}_a^{k(r+1)^2}$. Let $z_r : \Phi_r(\mathbb{G}_a^k) \rightarrow T(\Phi_r(\mathbb{G}_a^k))$ defined by $x \mapsto (0, x)$; this map identifies $\Phi_r(\mathbb{G}_a^k)$ and $T(\Phi_r(\mathbb{G}_a^k))_0$. Since $\Phi_r(G)$ is an algebraic subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_a^{k(r+1)^2}$, its defining ideal is generated by linear polynomials, and thus its tangent space at 0 is defined by the same polynomials. This means that z_r restricts to an isomorphism $\Phi_r(G) \rightarrow T(\Phi_r(G))_0$. Hence $(z_r : r \geq 0)$ identifies the prolongation sequence of G and the prolongation sequence of $T_{\sigma, D}(G)_0$. For the moreover part, it suffices to note that, by our construction above, the restriction of z_r to $\Phi_r(H)$ is an isomorphism between $\Phi_r(H)$ and $T(\Phi_r(H))_0$. $\square$

We will see now to reduce some questions concerning groups definable in a model of *DCFA* to questions on groups definable in *DCF* or *ACFA*. These ideas are, actually, implicit in the axioms of *DCFA*.

Let G be a connected differential algebraic group defined over $E = acl(E)$.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $G^{(n)} = G \times \sigma(G) \times \dots \times \sigma^n(G)$, and let q_n be the group homomorphism from G to $G^{(n)}$ defined by $q_n(g) = (g, \sigma(g), \dots, \sigma^n(g))$.

Let g be a generic point of G such that the tuples $g, \sigma(g), \dots, \sigma^n(g)$ are differentially independent over E ; then $q_n(g)$ is a generic point of $G^{(n)}$; thus $q_n(G)$ is dense in $G^{(n)}$ (for the D -topology) and $G^{(n)}$ is connected (in *DCF*).

Let H be a definable subgroup of G . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $H^{(n)}$ be the differential Zariski closure of $q_n(H)$ in $G^{(n)}$; then $H^{(n)}$ is a differential algebraic subgroup of $G^{(n)}$.

Let $\tilde{H}^{(n)} = \{g \in G : q_n(g) \in H^{(n)}\}$. These subgroups of G form a decreasing sequence of quantifier-free definable groups containing H . Let $\tilde{H} = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \tilde{H}^{(n)}$; since the (σ, D) -topology is Noetherian, there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{H} = \tilde{H}^{(N)}$. Then $\tilde{H}$ is the difference-differential Zariski closure of H .

Lemma 3.4.20 *Let G be a connected differential algebraic group and let H be a definable subgroup of $G(\mathcal{U})$ defined over $E = \text{acl}(E)$, $\tilde{H}$ its difference-differential Zariski closure. Then $[\tilde{H} : H] < \infty$.*

Proof:

Let $g, h \in G$. By definition, $g \perp_E h$ if and only if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ $q_n(g)$ and $q_n(h)$ are independent over E in the sense of DCF. This implies easily that if $g \in H$, then g is a generic of H if and only if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ $q_n(g)$ is a generic of $H^{(n)}$ (in the sense of DCF). Thus a generic of H will be a generic of $\tilde{H}$ and, by 1.5.7, $SU(H) = SU(\tilde{H})$ and $[\tilde{H} : H] < \infty$.

□

Definition 3.4.21 *Let G be a quantifier-free definable group defined in a model of DCFA. We say that G is quantifier-free connected if it has no proper quantifier-free definable subgroups of finite index. By Noetherianity, every quantifier-free definable group G has a smallest quantifier-free definable subgroup of finite index which we call the quantifier-free connected component of G .*

Remark 3.4.22 *In DCFA H is quantifier-free-connected if and only if for all n $q_n(H)$ is connected for the D -topology.*

Corollary 3.4.23

1. *Let H be a quantifier-free definable subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_a^n(\mathcal{U})$. Then H is a $\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$ -vector space, so it is divisible and has therefore no subgroup of finite index. This implies that every definable subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_a^n(\mathcal{U})$ is quantifier-free definable.*
2. *Let G be a definable subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_a^n$, $H < G$. Then G/H is definably isomorphic to a subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_a^l$ for some l .*

Proof:

(1) Using the fact that every algebraic subgroup of a vector group is defined by linear equations, it follows easily that every differential subgroup of a vector group is defined by linear differential equations. Hence, in the notation introduced above, each $\tilde{H}^n$ is defined by linear differential equations, and this implies that H is defined by linear (σ, D) -equations. Thus H is stable by multiplication by elements of $\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$, and is therefore a $(\text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ -vector space.

This proves the first assertion, and the others are clear, using the fact that every definable group has finite index in its (σ, D) -closure (by 3.4.20).

(2) Let L be an l -tuple of linear difference-differential equations such that $H = \text{Ker}(L)$. Then L defines a group homomorphism $G \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_a^l$ with kernel H . $L(G)$ is a definable subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_a^l$.

□

Corollary 3.4.24 *Let G be a (σ, D) -subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_a^k$. Suppose that for every proper definable subgroup H of G , $m(H) < m(G)$. Then $m(V) < m(G)$ for any proper (σ, D) -subvariety of G . In particular the generic type of G is regular.*

Proof:

Let V be a (σ, D) -type minimal (σ, D) -subvariety of G such that $m(V) = m(G)$. After possibly replacing V by a translate we may assume that $0 \in V$ is non-singular. By 3.4.13, $m(T(V)_0) = m(V) = m(G)$. Since $T(V)_0$ is a subgroup of $T(G)_0 \simeq G$, we obtain $T(V)_0 = T(G)_0$. By 3.4.12, $P_V = P_{T(V)_0} = P_{T(G)_0} = P_G$. Hence $V = G$. By 3.4.17, the generic type of G is regular.

□

Lemma 3.4.25 *Let a, c be tuples of $\mathcal{U}$. Let V be the (σ, D) -locus of a over K . Assume that $c = \text{Cb}(qftp(a/\text{acl}(Kc)))$. Then there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and a tuple d in $\mathcal{A}_m V_a$ such that $c \in K(a, d)_{\sigma, D}$.*

Proof:

Let U be the (σ, D) -locus of a over $\text{acl}(Kc)$. As $DCFA$ eliminates imaginaries every definable set has a canonical parameter. Then c is interdefinable with the canonical parameter of U which, by 3.4.7, is interdefinable over $K(a)_{\sigma, D}$ with the sequence of the canonical parameters of $\mathcal{A}_m U_a$ over $K(a)_{\sigma, D}$. By quantifier-free stability $\mathcal{A}_m U_a$ is defined with parameters from $\mathcal{A}_m U_a \subset \mathcal{A}_m V_a$.

□

Lemma 3.4.26 *Let (K, σ, D) be a submodel of $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$. Let V be a (σ, D) -variety defined over K and let $a \in V(\mathcal{U})$ be a non-singular point. Let $b \in \mathcal{A}_m V_a$. Then there are $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m = b$, such that $b_i \in \text{acl}(Ka, b)$ and each b_i is in some $K \cup \{a, b_{i-1}\}$ -definable principal homogeneous space for $T(V)_a$.*

Proof:

By 3.4.1 and 3.4.10 each fiber $\rho_{i+1, i} : \mathcal{A}_{i+1} V_a \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_i V_a$ is a principal homogeneous space for $T(V)_a$. Then set $b_i = \rho_{m, i}(b)$.

□

Lemma 3.4.27 *Let (K, σ, D) be a submodel of $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$. Let p be a (σ, D) -type minimal regular type over K such that $m(p) = d$. If p is not locally modular, then there are a vector group G and a quantifier-free type q such that:*

1. $m(q) = m(G) = d$.
2. $(x \in G) \in q$.
3. $p \not\vdash q$.

Proof:

By 1.2.24 and 1.2.25 we may assume that $SU(p) = \omega^i$ where $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. By 1.2.23, enlarging K if necessary, there are tuples a and c , with a a tuple of realisations of p , $tp(c/K)$ p -internal, $c = Cb(a/acl(Kc))$, $tp(a/Kc)$ p -semi-regular and $c \notin cl_p(Ka)$. Let V be the locus of a over K .

By 3.4.25, there is a k -tuple d in $A_m V_a(\mathcal{U})$ such that $c \in acl(K, a, d)$. For $i = 1, \dots, m$ let $d_i = \rho_{m,i}(d)$. Then for each i , d_i is in some $K(ad_{i-1})$ -definable $T(V)_a^k$ -principal homogeneous space.

Let $m = w_p(c/Ka)$. This means that for any $L = acl(L) \subset \mathcal{U}$ such that $L \perp_{KC}$, given a tuple $(g_1, \dots, g_m)$ realizing $p^{(m)}$ we have that $g_i \not\perp_L c$ for all i if and only if $g \subset cl_p(Lc)$. As $c \in acl(K, a, d)$, $c \notin cl_p(K, a)$, $tp(c/K)$ is p -internal, there is $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $w_p(c/Kad_{j-1}) = m$ and $w_p(c/Kad_j) \leq m - 1$. Let $L = acl(L) \subset \mathcal{U}$ contain Kad_{j-1} , such that $L \perp_K C$, and $(g_1, \dots, g_m)$ realizing $p^{(m)}$ such that $g_i \not\perp_L c$ for all i . Since $w_p(c/Kad_{j-1}) > w_p(c/Kad_j)$, either there is g_k such that $g_k \perp_{Ld_j} c$, or $tp(g_k/Ld_j)$ forks over L . In both cases, d_j and g are dependent over L . Hence $tp(d_j/Kad_{j-1}) \not\perp p$.

Let $q = tp(d_j/Kad_{j-1})$.

Then we have $m(q) = m(H) \leq m(T(V)_a) = m(p)$, hence $m(p) = m(q)$.

□

Lemma 3.4.28 *Let p be a regular (σ, D) -type minimal type. If there are a (σ, D) -vector group G and a type q that satisfy the conclusions of 3.4.27, then there exists a (σ, D) -vector group whose generic type is regular, (σ, D) -type minimal and non-orthogonal to p .*

Proof:

We order the triplets $ord(G) = \{m(G), \dim_{\sigma, D}(G), SU(G)\}$ with the lexicographical order. We proceed by induction on $ord(G)$.

Claim:

We may assume that if H is a proper quantifier-free connected, quantifier-free definable subgroup of G , then $m(H) < m(G)$.

Proof: Suppose that $m(H) = m(G)$. Let $\mu : G \rightarrow G/H$ be the quotient map. By 3.4.14, $ord(G) > ord(G/H)$. If we replace q by a nonforking extension of q we may assume that H is defined over the domain A of q . Let a be a realization of q with $tp(a/A) \not\perp p$. As $q \not\perp p$, we have either $p \not\perp q_0 = qftp(\mu(a)/A)$ or $p \not\perp q' = qftp(a/A\mu(a))$. If $p \not\perp q_0$ then $m(p) \leq m(q_0)$ by 3.4.15, and since $(x \in G/H) \in q_0$, $m(q_0) \leq m(G/H) \leq m(G) = m(p)$. So $m(q_0) = m(p)$ and we apply induction hypothesis to p, q_0 and G/H . If $p \not\perp q'$, let b be a realization of $qftp(a/A\mu(a))$ such that $b \perp_{A\mu(a)} a$. Then $a - b \in H$ and $p \not\perp q'' = qftp(a - b/Ab)$ and the same argument applies.

By 3.4.24 and as q is realized in G and $m(p) = m(q) = m(G)$, q is a generic of G , and is regular and (σ, D) -type minimal.

□

Corollary 3.4.29 *Let p be regular non locally modular type. Then there is a (σ, D) -vector group G whose generic type is (σ, D) -type minimal and non-orthogonal to p .*

Proof:

By 3.4.18 there is a regular type q of minimal (σ, D) -type which is non-orthogonal to p . By 3.4.27, q satisfies the hypothesis of 3.4.28, then there is a (σ, D) -vector group G whose generic type r is nonorthogonal to q ; again by 1.2.16, then there is such an r which is non-orthogonal to p . $\square$

Lemma 3.4.30 *Let G be a (σ, D) -vector group and let p be its generic type. If p is regular there is a definable subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_a$ whose generic type is regular and non-orthogonal to p .*

Proof:

Suppose that $G < \mathbb{G}_a^d$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. One of the projections $\pi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_a$ must have an infinite image in $\mathbb{G}_a$. Let a realize p , then $\pi(a)$ realizes the generic type of $H = \pi(G)$; this type is $tp(\pi(a)/K)$ which is also regular. Hence H satisfies the conclusion of the lemma. $\square$

Theorem 3.4.31 *Let p be a regular non locally modular type. Then there is a definable subgroup of the additive group whose generic type is regular and non-orthogonal to p .*

Proof:

By 3.4.29 there is a (σ, D) -vector group G whose generic type q is regular and non-orthogonal to p , by 3.4.30 there is a definable subgroup H of the additive group whose generic type r is regular and non-orthogonal to q . By transitivity $p \not\perp r$. $\square$

Lemma 3.4.32 *Let G be a definable subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_a^n$. If G has infinite dimension then $SU(G) \geq \omega$.*

Proof:

By 3.4.23, G is quantifier-free definable and is a $(Fix\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ -vector space. If $g_1, \dots, g_n \in G$ are $(Fix\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})$ -linearly independent, then the subgroup H they generate is definable and has SU -rank n (since it is definably isomorphic to $(Fix\sigma \cap \mathcal{C})^n$). Thus our hypothesis implies that G contains elements of arbitrarily high finite SU -rank, and therefore that $SU(G) \geq \omega$. $\square$

Theorem 3.4.33 *Let p be a regular type of SU -rank 1. If p is non locally modular then it is non-orthogonal to $Fix\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$.*

Proof:

By 3.4.31 there is a definable subgroup G of $\mathbb{G}_a$ whose generic type q is regular, (σ, D) -type minimal and non-orthogonal to p . $p \not\perp q$ implies that $SU(q) = \alpha + 1$ for some α . Then, by 5.4.3 of [35], G contains a definable subgroup N such that $SU(G/N) < \omega$, and by 3.4.32 and 3.4.21, G must be finite-dimensional. Thus, by 3.3.9, $p \not\perp \text{Fix}\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$. $\square$

Chapter 4

Definable Groups

This chapter is devoted to the study of definable groups in *DCFA*. The fact that in difference-differential fields, having infinite (σ, D) -transcendence degree does not characterize the (σ, D) -generic type, represents a difficulty in the treatment of definable groups, so we shall try different ways to describe certain kind of definable groups departing from properties of groups definable in differential and difference fields. In the first section we follow the work of Kowalski and Pillay ([15]) to show that a definable group is embedded in an algebraic group. Section 2 is devoted to the study 1-basedness, stability and stable embeddability of commutative groups.

4.1 A Definable Group is Embedded in an Algebraic Group

We introduce $*$ -definable groups in stable theories. Suppose that T is a complete theory and M a saturated model of T . A $*$ -tuple is a tuple $(a_i)_{i \in I}$, where I is an index set of cardinality less than the cardinality of M , and $a_i \in M^{eq}$ for all $i \in I$. Let $A \subset M$. A $*$ -definable set is a collection of $*$ -tuples, indexed by the same set of parameters I , which is the set of realizations of a partial type $p(x_i)_{i \in I}$ over A . A $*$ -definable group is a group with $*$ -definable domain and multiplication.

The following propositions are proved in [15].

Proposition 4.1.1 *Let T be a stable theory; M a saturated model of T . Let a, b, c, x, y, z be $*$ -tuples of M of length strictly less than the cardinal of M , such that:*

1. $acl(M, a, b) = acl(M, a, c) = acl(M, b, c)$
2. $acl(M, a, x) = acl(M, a, y)$ and $Cb(stp(x, y/M, a))$ is interalgebraic with a over M .
3. As in 2. with b, z, y in place of a, x, y
4. As in 2. with c, z, x in place of a, x, y

5. Other than $\{a, b, c\}, \{a, x, y\}, \{b, z, y\}, \{c, z, x\}$, any 3-element subset of $\{a, b, c, x, y, z\}$ is independent over $\mathcal{M}$.

Then there is a $*$ -definable group H defined over M and $a', b', c' \in H$ generic independent over M such that a is interalgebraic with a' over M , b is interalgebraic with b' over M and c is interalgebraic with c' over M .

Proposition 4.1.2 *Let T be a simple theory; M a saturated model of T . Let G, H be type-definable groups, defined over $K \prec M$, and let $a, b, c \in G$ and $a', b', c' \in H$ such that*

1. a, b are generic independent over M .
2. $a \cdot b = c$ and $a' \cdot b' = c'$.
3. a is interalgebraic with a' over M , b is interalgebraic with b' over M and c is interalgebraic with c' over M .

Then there is a type-definable over M subgroup G_1 of bounded index in G , and a type-definable over M subgroup H_1 of H and a type-definable over M isomorphism f between G_1/N_1 and H_1/N_2 where N_1 and N_2 are finite normal subgroups of G_1 and H_1 respectively.

Remark 4.1.3 *If T in 4.1.2 is supersimple and G, H are definable, then we can choose G_1 definable of finite index in G and f definable.*

The following result is proved in [8]:

Proposition 4.1.4 *Let G be a $*$ -definable group in a stable structure. Then there is a projective system of definable groups with inverse limit G' , and a $*$ -definable isomorphism between G and G' .*

Theorem 4.1.5 *Let $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$ be a model of DCFA, $K \prec \mathcal{U}$ and G a K -definable group. Then there is an algebraic group H , a definable subgroup G_1 of G of finite index, and a definable isomorphism between G_1/N_1 and H_1/N_2 , where H_1 is a definable subgroup of $H(\mathcal{U})$, N_1 is a finite normal subgroup of G_1 , and N_2 is a finite normal subgroup of H_1 .*

Proof:

Let a, b, y be generic independent elements of G over K . Let $x = a \cdot y, z = b^{-1} \cdot y, c = a \cdot b$, so $x = c \cdot z$. Let $\bar{a} = (D^i \sigma^j(a) : i \in \mathbb{N}, j \in \mathbb{Z})$, and similarly for $\bar{b}, \bar{c}, \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}$. Then by 2.2.14, working in ACF , $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}, \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}$ satisfy the conditions of 4.1.1. Thus there is a $*$ -definable group H over K , and generic K -independent elements $a^*, b^*, c^* \in H$ such that $\bar{a}$ is interalgebraic with a^* over K , $\bar{b}$ is interalgebraic with b^* over K , $\bar{c}$ is interalgebraic with c^* over K and $c^* = a^* \cdot b^*$ (the interalgebraicity is in the sense of ACF).

Since ACF is ω -stable, by 4.1.4, H is the inverse limit of $H_i, i \in \omega$, where the H_i are algebraic groups.

Let $\pi_i : H \longrightarrow H_i$ be the i -th canonical epimorphism. Let $a_i = \pi_i(a^*)$, $b_i = \pi_i(b^*)$ and $c_i = \pi_i(c^*)$. Then a^* is interalgebraic with $(a_i)_{i \in \omega}$ over K , b^* is interalgebraic with $(b_i)_{i \in \omega}$ over K and c^* is interalgebraic with $(c_i)_{i \in \omega}$ over K , all interalgebraicities in the sense of *ACF*.

Since for $i < j$, $a_i \in K(a_j)$, $b_i \in K(b_j)$ and $c_i \in K(c_j)$, there is $i \in \omega$ such that a is interalgebraic with a_i over K , b is interalgebraic with b_i over K and c is interalgebraic with c_i over K in the sense of *DCFA*. So we can apply 4.1.2 to $a, b, c \in G$ and $a_i, b_i, c_i \in H_i$.

□

4.2 Abelian Groups

In this section, we study abelian groups defined over some subset $K = acl(K)$ of a model $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$ of *DCFA*. We investigate whether they are 1-based, and whether they are stable stably embedded (i.e., stable with the structure induced by $\mathcal{U}$). By 4.1.5 and 1.2.4, we may reduce to the case when the group H is a quantifier-free definable subgroup of some commutative algebraic group G , and G has no proper (infinite) algebraic subgroup, i.e. G is either $\mathbb{G}_a$, $\mathbb{G}_m$, or a simple Abelian variety A .

From now on we suppose all the groups are quantifier-free definable.

The additive group

Proposition 4.2.1 *No infinite definable subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_a^n(\mathcal{U})$ is 1-based.*

Proof.

Let $H < \mathbb{G}_a^n$ be a definable infinite group. By 3.4.23, H is quantifier-free definable and contains a definable subgroup H_0 which is definably isomorphic to $Fix\sigma \cap \mathcal{C}$. Hence H is not 1-based.

□

The multiplicative group

The logarithmic derivative $lD : \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_a$, $x \mapsto Dx/x$ is a group epimorphism with $Ker(lD) = \mathbb{G}_m(\mathcal{C})$.

Given a polynomial $P(T) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i T^i \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$, we denote by $P(\sigma)$ the homomorphism defined by $x \mapsto \sum_{i=0}^n a_i \sigma^i(x)$.

Proposition 4.2.2 *Let H be a quantifier-free $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,D}$ -definable subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_m$. If $lD(H) \neq 0$ then H is not 1-based. If $lD(H) = 0$ then there is a polynomial $P(T)$ such that $H = Ker(P(\sigma))$. Then we have that H is 1-based if and only if $P(T)$ is relatively prime to all cyclotomic polynomials $T^m - 1$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$*

Proof.

By 4.2.1, if $lD(H) \neq 0$ then H is not 1-based. If $lD(H) = 0$, as $\text{Ker}(lD) = \mathbb{G}_m(\mathcal{C})$, H is $\mathcal{L}_\sigma$ -definable in $\mathcal{C}$. Hence there is a polynomial $P(T) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i T^i \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ such that H is defined by $\prod_{i=0}^n \sigma^i(X^{a_i}) = 1$. In *ACFA*, H is 1-based, stable, stably embedded if and only if $P(T)$ is relatively prime to all cyclotomic polynomials $T^m - 1$ for $m \geq 1$ (see [10]). By 2.5.4 the same holds for *DCFA*.

□

Abelian varieties

First we mention some facts about Abelian varieties in difference and differential fields. For a detailed exposition on Abelian varieties the reader may consult [17].

Definition 4.2.3 *An Abelian variety is a connected algebraic group A which is complete, that is, for any variety V the projection $\pi : A \times V \rightarrow V$ is a closed map.*

As a consequence of the definition we have that an Abelian variety is commutative. Let B be an algebraic subgroup of an Abelian variety A . Then A/B is an Abelian variety. If in addition B is connected B is an Abelian variety. An Abelian variety is called simple if it has no infinite proper Abelian subvarieties. Let A and B be two Abelian varieties. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a homomorphism. We say that f is an isogeny if f is surjective and $\text{Ker}(f)$ is finite. We say that A and B are isogenous if there are isogenies $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow A$.

Proposition 4.2.4 (*ACF*) *There is no nontrivial algebraic homomorphism from a vector group into an Abelian variety.*

Now we mention some properties concerning 1-basedness of Abelian varieties in difference and differential fields. Consider a saturated model $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma)$ of *ACFA*.

In [10], Hrushovski gives a full description of definable subgroups of $A(\mathcal{U})$ when A is a simple Abelian variety defined over $\mathcal{U}$. When A is defined over $\text{Fix}\sigma$, this description is particularly simple, at least up to commensurability. Let $R = \text{End}(A)$ (the ring of algebraic endomorphisms of A). If $P(T) = \sum_{i=0}^n e_i T^i \in R[T]$, define $\text{Ker}(P(\sigma)) = \{a \in A(\mathcal{U}) \mid \sum_{i=0}^n e_i(\sigma^i(a)) = 0\}$.

Proposition 4.2.5 (*ACFA*, [10]) *Let A be a simple Abelian variety defined over $\mathcal{U}$, and let B be a definable subgroup of $A(\mathcal{U})$ of finite SU -rank.*

1. *If A is not isomorphic to an Abelian variety defined over $(\text{Fix}\sigma)^{\text{alg}}$, then B is 1-based and stable stably embedded.*
2. *Assume that A is defined over $\text{Fix}\sigma$. Then there is $P(T) \in R[T]$ such that $B \cap \text{Ker}(P(\sigma))$ has finite index in B and in $\text{Ker}(P(\sigma))$. Then B is 1-based if and only if the polynomial $P(T)$ is relatively prime to all cyclotomic polynomials $T^m - 1$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. If B is 1-based, then it is also stable stably embedded.*

We work now in a saturated model $(\mathcal{U}, D)$ of *DCF*.

Proposition 4.2.6 *Let A be an Abelian variety. Then there is a $\mathcal{L}_D$ -definable (canonical) homomorphism $\mu : A \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_a^n$, for $n = \dim(A)$, such that $\text{Ker}(\mu)$ has finite Morley rank.*

the kernel of this canonical homomorphism, $\text{Ker}(\mu)$, is known as the Manin kernel of A , we denote it by $A^\sharp$.

Proposition 4.2.7 (Properties of the Manin Kernel, see [20] for the proofs)
Let A and B be Abelian varieties. Then

1. $A^\sharp$ is the Kolchin closure of the torsion subgroup $\text{Tor}(A)$ of A .
2. $(A \times B)^\sharp = A^\sharp \times B^\sharp$, and if $B < A$ then $B \cap A^\sharp = B^\sharp$.
3. A differential isogeny between $A^\sharp$ and $B^\sharp$ is the restriction of an algebraic isogeny from A to B .

Definition 4.2.8 *We say that an Abelian variety descends to the constants if it is isomorphic to an Abelian variety defined over the constants.*

Proposition 4.2.9 (DCF, see [20]) *Let A be a simple Abelian variety. If A is defined over $\mathcal{C}$, then $A^\sharp = A(\mathcal{C})$. If A does not descend to the constants, then $A^\sharp$ is strongly minimal and 1-based.*

We now return to $DCFA$ and fix a saturated model $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma, D)$ of $DCFA$ and a simple Abelian variety A defined over $K = \text{acl}(K) \subset \mathcal{U}$.

Let H be an $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma, D}$ -definable connected subgroup of A defined over the difference-differential field K . Since H is 1-based if and only if $\tilde{H}$ is 1-based, we can suppose that H is quantifier-free definable and quantifier-free connected.

Let $\mu : A \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_a^d$ as in 4.2.6. If $H \not\subset \text{Ker} \mu$ then by 4.2.1 H is not 1-based.

Assume that $H \subset A^\sharp$. We first show a very useful lemma.

Lemma 4.2.10 *Let H be a quantifier-free definable subgroup of $A^\sharp$ which is quantifier-free connected. Then $H = H' \cap A^\sharp$ for some quantifier-free $\mathcal{L}_\sigma$ -definable subgroup H' of A .*

Proof:

Our hypotheses imply that there is an integer k and a differential subgroup S of $A \times A^\sigma \times \cdots \times A^{\sigma^k}$ such that $H = \{a \in A : (a, \sigma(a), \dots, \sigma^k(a)) \in S\}$. By 4.2.7.2, replacing S by its Zariski closure $\bar{S}$ we get $H = \{a \in A^\sharp : (a, \sigma(a), \dots, \sigma^k(a)) \in \bar{S}\}$. Thus $H = H' \cap A^\sharp$, with $H' = \{a \in A : (a, \sigma(a), \dots, \sigma^k(a)) \in \bar{S}\}$.

□

Case 1: A is isomorphic to a simple Abelian variety A' defined over $\mathcal{C}$.

We can suppose that A is defined over $\mathcal{C}$. Then, by 4.2.9, $A^\sharp = A(\mathcal{C})$. Then H is 1-based

for $DCFA$ if and only if it is 1-based for $ACFA$, by 2.5.4, and in that case it will also be stable stably embedded (by 2.5.6)

If $H = A(\mathcal{C})$ then we know that H is not 1-based in $ACFA$.

If H is a proper subgroup of $A(\mathcal{C})$, 4.2.5 gives a precise description of that case.

Case 2: A does not descend to $\mathcal{C}$.

Then, by [20], $A^\sharp$ is strongly minimal and 1-based for DCF . By 2.5.9 it is 1-based for $DCFA$.

Let us first note an immediate consequence of 4.2.10 :

Corollary 4.2.11 *If for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, A and A^{σ^k} are not isogenous, then $SU(A^\sharp) = 1$.*

We will now investigate stability and stable embeddability of H . By 1-basedness and quantifier-free ω -stability, we know that if $X \subset A^\sharp$ is quantifier-free definable, then X is a Boolean combination of cosets of quantifier-free definable subgroups of $A^\sharp$.

Assume first that $H \neq A^\sharp$, and let a be a generic of H over K . Then H is finite-dimensional, and therefore $SU(H) < \omega$. As H is 1-based, there is an increasing sequence of subgroups H_i of H with $SU(H_{i+1}/H_i) = 1$.

By 4.2.10, we may assume that $H_i = U_i \cap A^\sharp$ for some quantifier-free $\mathcal{L}_\sigma$ -definable subgroups U_i of A . Note that 4.2.10 also implies that each quotient U_{i+1}/U_i is c -minimal (i.e., all quantifier-free definable $\mathcal{L}_\sigma$ -definable subgroups are either finite or of finite index). Furthermore, by elimination of imaginaries in $ACFA$, $acl_\sigma(Ka)$ contains tuples a_i coding the cosets $a + U_i$. Hence $tp(a/K)$ satisfies the conditions of 2.5.8 and we obtain that if $tp_{ACFA}(a/K)$ is stable stably embedded then so is $tp(a/K)$.

For the other direction, observe that if $tp_{ACFA}(a/K)$ is not stable stably embedded, then for some i , the generic $ACFA$ -type of U_{i+1}/U_i is non-orthogonal to $\sigma(x) = x$, and there is a $(\mathcal{L}_\sigma)$ -definable morphism ψ with finite kernel $U_{i+1}/U_i \rightarrow B(Fix\sigma^k)$ for some k and Abelian variety B (see [10]). But, returning to $DCFA$, no non-algebraic type realized in $Fix\sigma^k$ can be stable stably embedded, since for instance the formula $\varphi(x, y) = \exists z \ z^2 = x + y \wedge \sigma(z) = z$ is not definable (2.5.4,3). This proves the other implication.

Thus we have shown:

If H is finite dimensional, then $tp(a/K)$ is stable stably embedded if and only if $tp_{ACFA}(a/K)$ is stable stably embedded.

Using 4.2.10, 4.2.5 gives us a full description of that case.

In particular, we then have that if H is not stable stably embedded, then A is isomorphic to an Abelian variety defined over $Fix\sigma^k$ for some k .

Let us now assume that $H = A^\sharp$. Let a be a generic of H over K . Then $tp_{ACFA}(a, \dots, D^m a/K)$ is the generic type of an algebraic variety V , and is therefore stationary (by 2.11 of [2]). Thus, using the finite dimensional case, if A is not isomorphic to an Abelian variety defined over $(Fix\sigma)^{alg}$, then H is stable stably embedded. If A is isomorphic to a variety B defined over $Fix\sigma^k$, via an isomorphism ψ , then the subgroup $\psi^{-1}(Ker(\sigma^k - 1)) \cap A^\sharp$ is not stable stably embedded.

We summarize the results obtained:

Theorem 4.2.12 *Let A be a simple Abelian variety, and let H be a quantifier-free definable subgroup of $A(\mathcal{U})$ defined over $K = \text{acl}(K)$. If $H \not\subset A^\sharp(\mathcal{U})$, then H is not 1-based. Assume now that $H \subset A^\sharp(\mathcal{U})$, and let a be a generic of H over K . Then*

1. *If A is defined over the field $\mathcal{C}$ of constants, then H is 1-based if and only if it is stable stably embedded, if and only if $\text{tp}_{\text{ACFA}}(a/K)$ is hereditarily orthogonal to $(\sigma(x) = x)$. The results in [10] yield a complete description of the subgroups H which are not 1-based.*
2. *If A does not descend to the field $\mathcal{C}$ of constants, then H is 1-based. Moreover*
 - (a) *If A is not isomorphic to an Abelian variety defined over $\text{Fix}\sigma^k$ for some k , then H is stable stably embedded.*
 - (b) *Assume that A is defined over $\text{Fix}(\sigma)$. Then H is stable stably embedded if and only if $\text{tp}_{\text{ACFA}}(a/K)$ is stable stably embedded. Again, the results in [10] give a full description of this case.*

Bibliography

- [1] James Ax. The elementary theory of finite fields. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 88:239–271, 1968.
- [2] Zoé Chatzidakis and Ehud Hrushovski. Model theory of difference fields. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 351(8):2997–3071, 1999.
- [3] Zoé Chatzidakis and Anand Pillay. Generic structures and simple theories. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 95(1-3):71–92, 1998.
- [4] Richard M. Cohn. *Difference algebra*. Interscience Publishers John Wiley & Sons, New York-London-Sydney, 1965.
- [5] Richard M. Cohn. Systems of ideals. *Canad. J. Math.*, 21:783–807, 1969.
- [6] Richard M. Cohn. A difference-differential basis theorem. *Canad. J. Math.*, 22:1224–1237, 1970.
- [7] David Eisenbud. *Commutative algebra*, volume 150 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. With a view toward algebraic geometry.
- [8] Ehud Hrushovski. Unidimensional theories are superstable. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 50(2):117–138, 1990.
- [9] Ehud Hrushovski. Pseudo-finite fields and related structures. *manuscript*, 1991.
- [10] Ehud Hrushovski. The Manin-Mumford conjecture and the model theory of difference fields. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 112(1):43–115, 2001.
- [11] Ehud Hrushovski and Anand Pillay. Weakly normal groups. In *Logic colloquium '85 (Orsay, 1985)*, volume 122 of *Stud. Logic Found. Math.*, pages 233–244. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987.
- [12] Byunghan Kim and Anand Pillay. Simple theories. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 88(2-3):149–164, 1997. Joint AILA-KGS Model Theory Meeting (Florence, 1995).
- [13] E. R. Kolchin. *Differential algebra and algebraic groups*. Academic Press, New York, 1973. Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 54.

- [14] E. R. Kolchin. *Differential algebraic groups*, volume 114 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press Inc., Orlando, FL, 1985.
- [15] Piotr Kowalski and Anand Pillay. A note on groups definable in difference fields. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 130(1):205–212 (electronic), 2002.
- [16] Serge Lang. *Algebra*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, Mass., 1965.
- [17] Serge Lang. *Abelian varieties*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983. Reprint of the 1959 original.
- [18] H. Lejeune. *Paires de corps P.A.C. parfaits, paires de corps pseudofinis*. Thèse de Doctorat, Paris 7, 1995.
- [19] D. Marker, M. Messmer, and A. Pillay. *Model theory of fields*, volume 5 of *Lecture Notes in Logic*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [20] David. Marker. Manin kernels. In *Connections between model theory and algebraic and analytic geometry*, volume 6 of *Quad. Mat.*, pages 1–21. Dept. Math., Seconda Univ. Napoli, Caserta, 2000.
- [21] David Marker. Model theory of differential fields. In *Model theory, algebra, and geometry*, volume 39 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 53–63. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [22] R. Moosa, Pillay A., and T. Scanlon. Differential arcs and regular types in differential fields. *preprint*, 2004.
- [23] David Pierce and Anand Pillay. A note on the axioms for differentially closed fields of characteristic zero. *J. Algebra*, 204(1):108–115, 1998.
- [24] Anand Pillay. *An introduction to stability theory*, volume 8 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 1983.
- [25] Anand Pillay. *Geometric stability theory*, volume 32 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 1996. Oxford Science Publications.
- [26] Anand Pillay. Definability and definable groups in simple theories. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 63(3):788–796, 1998.
- [27] Anand Pillay. Model-theoretic consequences of a theorem of Campana and Fujiki. *Fund. Math.*, 174(2):187–192, 2002.
- [28] Anand Pillay. *Lecture Notes on Stability*. Fall 2003.
- [29] Anand Pillay and Dominika Polkowska. On PAC and bounded substructures of a stable structure. *Preprint*, 2004.

- [30] Anand Pillay and Martin Ziegler. Jet spaces of varieties over differential and difference fields. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 9(4):579–599, 2003.
- [31] Bruno Poizat. *Groupes stables*. Nur al-Mantiq wal-Maʿrifah, 2. Bruno Poizat, Lyon, 1987. Une tentative de conciliation entre la géométrie algébrique et la logique mathématique.
- [32] I. R. Shafarevich. *Basic algebraic geometry*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, study edition, 1977. Translated from the Russian by K. A. Hirsch, Revised printing of Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Vol. 213, 1974.
- [33] L. van den Dries and K. Schmidt. Bounds in the theory of polynomial rings over fields. A nonstandard approach. *Invent. Math.*, 76(1):77–91, 1984.
- [34] Frank O. Wagner. *Stable groups*, volume 240 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [35] Frank O. Wagner. *Simple theories*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2000.
- [36] Frank O. Wagner. Some remarks on one-basedness. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 69(1):34–38, 2004.
- [37] Carol Wood. Differentially closed fields. In *Model theory and algebraic geometry*, volume 1696 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 129–141. Springer, Berlin, 1998.